EARLY INDIAN POLITICAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE SYSTEMS

Edited by
D. C. SIRCAR
Carmichael Professor and Head of the Department of Ancient Indian History and Culture, University of Calcutta.

CALCUTTA UNIVERSITY
CENTRAL LIBRARY

UNIVERSITY OF CALCUTTA
1972

FIRST PUBLISHED.....1972

934
Ea76
C5

BCU 3750

403433

PRINTED IN INDIA
PUBLISHED BY SRI SIBENDRANATH KANJILAL,
SUPERINTENDENT, CALCUTTA UNIVERSITY PRESS,
48, HAZRA ROAD, CALCUTTA-19,
AND
PRINTED BY SRI A. P. SENGUPTA AT GRANTHA PARIKRAMA PRESS,
30/1B, COLLEGE ROW, CALCUTTA-9.
Price Rs. 12.00

CENTRE OF ADVANCED STUDY IN
ANCIENT INDIAN HISTORY AND CULTURE
UNIVERSITY OF CALCUTTA
LECTURES AND SEMINARS
No. VII-B (SEMINARS)
PART II

CONTENTS

	Subject	*Page*
	Proceedings of the Seminar—Second Day	1
1.	The Queen in the North Indian Kingdoms during the Pre-Gupta Period *by* Dr. D. K. Ganguli, Visva-Bharati University, Santiniketan.	10
2.	Rājadharma in the Mahābhārata and the Aśokan Inscriptions *by* Sri R. K. Billorey, Centre of Advanced Study in AIHC, Calcutta University.	21
3.	Non-Monarchical Institutions and the Evidence of Coins *by* Dr. Sm. B. Lahiri, Jadavpur University.	25
4.	The Supposed Joint- and Sub-Kings amongst Early Indo-Greek Rulers *by* Dr. A. N. Lahiri, Calcutta University. ...	34
5.	An Aspect of the Government Policy in Ancient India *by* Dr. B. Chatterji, Burdwan University.	44
6.	Some Principles of Rāja-Dharma *by* Prof. D. C. Sircar, Calcutta University.	51
7.	Royal Strategy and Defensive Warfare in Ancient India *by* Dr. A. K. Chatterjee, Centre of Advanced Study in AIHC, Calcutta University.	63
8.	Forms and Features of Governmental System in the Age of the Rāmāyaṇa *by* Prof. U. Thakur, Magadh University, Bodhgaya.	67
9.	Amātya Seals *by* Dr. K. K. Thaplyal, Lucknow University. ...	76
10.	The Role of Mahājanas in South Indian Administration *by* Dr. O. P. Verma, Nagpur University.	81
11.	Administrative System of the Later Somavaṁśis *by* Sri K. S. Behera, Utkal University, Bhubaneswar.	87
12.	Divine Kingship in Ancient Cambodia : A Study of the Praśastis *by* Sri A. K. Chakravarti, Government Sanskrit College, Calcutta.	91
	SUPPLEMENT	
13.	Administrative System in Pāli Literature *by* Dr. J. R. Haldar, Centre of Advanced Study in AIHC, Calcutta University. ...	114
14.	Official Designations in Early Mathurā Inscriptions *by* Sm. K. Bajpeyi, Centre of Advanced Study in AIHC, Calcutta University.	130
	INDEX	141

PREFACE

The seventh annual series of two days' inter-university seminars was held at our Centre of Advanced Study in February, 1971, on (1) Religious Life in Ancient India, and (2) Early Indian Political and Administrative Systems. The proceedings of the Second day's seminar on Political and Administrative Systems, together with papers prsented on the occasion, are now placed in the hands of the students of ancient Indian history.

The proceedings have been drawn up, as usual, on the notes submitted by the Reporters. Dr. A. K. Chatterjee and Sri R. K. Billorey have rendered me some help in the work of editing them. The papers, edited without changing the authors' ideas, have been roughly arranged on a chronological basis.

The index of this volume has been prepared by Dr. Sm. J. Maitra.

Centre of Advanced Study, Dept.. of
Ancient Indian History and Culture,
Calcutta University, 51/2,Hazra Road,
Calcutta-19. 15th May, 1972.

D. C. SIRCAR
Director

Proceedings of the Seminar

Second Day

Date : 26th February, 1971.
Time : 10-30 A.M. to 1 P.M. and 2-30 to 5 P.M.
Subject : Early Indian Political and Administrative Systems.
Place : Lecture Hall, Department of Ancient Indian History and Culture, Calcutta University.
Chairman : PROF. D. C. SIRCAR, Calcutta University.

Participants besides the Chairman

1.	DR. O. P. VERMA	Nagpur University
2.	SM. S. SENGUPTA	Delhi University
3.	DR. D. K. GANGULY	Visva-Bharati University, Santiniketan
4.	DR. SM. B. LAHIRI	Jadavpur University
5.	DR. B. CHATTERJEE	Burdwan University
6.	DR. A. N. LAHIRI	Calcutta University
7.	DR. S. R. DAS	Do
8.	DR. K. K. DASGUPTA	Do
9.	DR. A. K. CHATTERJEE	Centre of Advanced Study in AIHC, Calcutta University
10.	SM. K. BAJPEYI	Do
11.	SRI R. K. BILLOREY	Do
12.	SRI J. R. HALDAR	Do
13.	SRI A. K. JHA	Do
14.	SRI A. K. CHAKRAVARTI	Government Sanskrit College, Calcutta

and others.

Reporters : DR. S. P. SINGH
SRI B. P. MISHRA
SM. K. BAJPEYI

Morning Session

The session began at 10-30 A.M. Prof. Sircar welcomed the scholars who had assembled to participate in the Seminar.

Dr. S. P. Singh was first invited to read his paper entitled 'Some Aspects of Currency Administration in Ancient India'. According to Dr. Singh the metallic currency in India was introduced by the commercial community. He supported the view that the coinage in ancient India was not the sole privilege of the State.

Commenting on the paper, Dr. S. Bandyopadhyay observed that it does not add much to what had already been said by himself in a paper entitled 'Early Indian Coinage and the Commercial Community' presented at the 59th Annual Conference of the Numismatic Society of India held at Patna under the auspices of the Patna university. He also pointed out that the title of the paper is misleading as it deals only with the issue and control of the punch-marked coins and not ancient Indian currency as a whole. Prof. Sircar agreed that the title was more comprehensive than the article itself. Dr. A. K. Chatterjee wanted to know the meaning of *niṣka*. There was some controversy on this between Dr. Singh and Dr. Bandyopadhyay. Prof. Sircar said that the word meant a necklace and also a metallic weight and a coin.

Sri A. K. Chakravarti next read his paper entitled 'Divine Kingship in Ancient Cambodia—a Study of *Praśastis*'. Sri Chakravarti pointed out that there was little original in the Cambodian conception of either the similarity of functions of the kings and gods, or of their complete identity. These ideas, according to him, were borrowed from India. While it was agreed that the idea of divine kingship was Indian, the possibility of local variation, he said, cannot be ignored altogether.

Sri R. K. Bhattacharya wanted to know the earliest reference to India in Cambodian records. Sri Chakravarti referred to the story of Kauṇḍinya in this connection. Prof. Sircar did not agree with Sri Chakravarti's views that the gods

Viṣṇu and Śiva are indicated by the royal title *Pṛthivīvallabha Parameśvara*. Sri Chakravarti mentioned a Cambodian inscription referring to a king conceived as a Trimūrti and regarded it as a local development. Prof. Sircar observed that a stanza in the Mainamati plates represent the Candra family as *devatray-ātman*. Prof. Sircar further pointed out that Samudragupta (c. 335-76 A.D.) is not only represented as the Acintyapuruṣa (Viṣṇu), but also as a god living on the earth as a human being. Dr. B. Chatterjee stated that the conception of the divine origin of kingship led to despotism not only in Cambodia, but also in ancient India. Prof. Sircar did not think that despotism has any relation with the concept of divine kingship.

Dr. D. K. Ganguly read a paper entitled 'The Queen in North Indian Kingdoms during the Pre-Gupta Period'. He said that the authors of the epics were more liberal to queens and women than Kauṭilya and Manu. The epic queens enjoyed a greater amount of freedom. They advised the king on matters of government and, in the absence of any male heir, even ascended the throne.

Commenting on the paper, Dr. O. P. Verma said that the social position of the queen should have been mentioned in it. Dr. S. K. Mitra wanted to know whether the queens exercised any sort of administrative function during the life time of the kings. Dr. Ganguly replied that there was no sufficient evidence to prove it. Prof. Sircar pointed out that the expression *asūryampaśya* occurs in Patañjali's *Mahābhāṣya* and not in Pāṇini's *Aṣṭādhyāyī*. He also observed that seclusion of the inmates of the royal harem is also mentioned in the *Mahābhārata*. He further stated that Aśoka in his inscriptions clearly distinguished between his own sons and other *devī-kumāras* (sons of queens). Dr. A. N. Lahiri drew attention to the view of Jenkins that Agathocleia was not the mother, but the wife of Strato I as she is shown on his left side, because the convention was to represent the wife on the left of the husband. But Prof. Sircar, Dr. Ganguly and some other participants expressed doubts about this suggestion and the example of the Candra-

gupta-Kumāradevī type of gold coins, representing queen Kumāradevī on the right side of king Candragupta, was cited. Prof. Sircar pointed out that the early history of Orissa witnessed the reign of no less than six queens.

Dr. A. K. Chatterjee read his paper entitled 'Royal Strategy and Defensive Warfare in Ancient India', in which he referred to some passages from the *Mahābhārata* and the *Arthaśāstra* of Kauṭilya, which give an idea about defensive warfare in ancient India. He said that it was only the innate strength and efficiency of the administrative machinery that could save a defending party from annihilation.

As regards the title of the paper, Dr. S. K. Mitra was doubtful about its suitability. In regard to the soldiers' emoluments, Prof. Sircar referred to the *Mahābhārata*, *Arthaśāstra* and *Rājataraṅgiṇī* and pointed out that they either enjoyed land for their service or were paid wages, and both the types received allowance while the soldiers were away on an expedition. Sri Mishra referred to the different devices employed for self-defence as narrated in the Laṅkā-kāṇḍa of the *Rāmāyaṇa* which, he said, should have been mentioned in Dr. Chatterjee's paper. Dr. Verma referred to the fort at Devagiri or Daulatābād. Prof. Sircar observed that the subject was too big to be satisfactorily dealt with in such a small paper.

Dr. O. P. Verma next read his paper on 'The Role of Mahājanas in South Indian Administration'. He pointed out that the Mahājanas played an important part in the village administration of the region under survey. They dominated the affairs of the village in all aspects and were the spokesmen of the village. Commenting on the paper, Dr. Ganguly observed that the subject has already been dealt with by many scholars. Dr. S. K. Mitra, however, thought that the paper gave a good description of the role of the Mahājanas in South Indian administration. He wanted to know whether the Mahājanas were royal officials. Dr. Verma replied that they functioned as a local administrative institution and were not royal officials. Prof. Sircar observed that they were usually

Brāhmaṇas and their institution functioned like a village Pañcāyat. He said that the *grāma-mahattara, vīthī-mahattara, viṣaya-mahattara*, etc., often mentioned in North Indian records had similar functions and met in separate assemblies. Prof. Sircar also referred to the Pañcāyat Board headed by the Nagara-śreṣṭhin who was assisted in the administration by the Prathama-Kāyastha and others. He further pointed out that the assembly of the Brāhmaṇas mentioned in the Lāhaḍapura inscription of Jayaccandra shows that village administration was similar in North and South India. Likewise, Prof. Sircar said, the Paschimbhag plate of Śrīcandra shows that the temple organisation of South India referred to in numerous records was also known in the North. Prof. Sircar also said that the whole of India exhibited more or less the same kind of social and religious institutions although evidence in respect of some parts is not quite clear.

Sm. Kalyani Bajpeyi then read her paper entitled 'Official Designations in the Early Inscriptions of Mathurā'. She tried to show how epigraphic evidence throws light on the administrative history of the Mathurā region. Initiating a discussion on the paper, Prof. Sircar observed that not only the Indian form of name, but even the Brāhmaṇical *gotra* was often adopted by the foreigners. He also drew Sm. Bajpeyi's attention to a recently published Mathurā inscription of the Kusāṇa age, which refers to the designation Kāyastha. Dr. A. K. Chatterjee thought that the *Mṛcchakaṭika* reference to Kāyastha is earlier that the Kuṣāṇa epigraph. But Prof. Sircar agreed with those scholars who assigned the drama to the 6th century A.D. Prof. Sircar also doubted the use of official designations in the same sense throughout the ages and in different parts of India. He pointed out that the term *Pañcamahāśabda* indicated the right to enjoy five types of musical instruments in South India ; but elsewhere the same term, he said, meant five official designations beginning with the word *mahā*. Prof. Sircar further pointed out, that in the South indian Inscriptions, *Mahādaṇḍanāyaka* was usually the designation of a governor and not a

military officer as suggested by early North Indian inscriptions. Regarding the term *grāmika*, Prof. Sirear said that it was an all-India institution and is mentioned in the inscriptions from all parts of India. Dr. S. R. Das wanted to know the relationship between the Kāyasthas of Bengal and those mentioned in the Mathurā inscription. Prof. Sircar observed the *Kāyastha* (scribe) was an official designation, but that the community of the Kāyasthas was the result of an admixture of the professional scribes of various communities including the Brāhmaṇa. Dr. D. K. Ganguly pointed out that the *Grāmika* enjoyed some land for his services. Prof. Sircar drew his attention to what Manu says about the remuneration of officers in charge of one *grāma*, five *grāmas*, ten *grāmas*, etc.

The Morning Session ended at 1 P.M. for lunch.

Afternoon Session

The afternoon session began at 2-30 P.M. Dr. B. Chatterjee read his paper entitled 'An Aspect of the Government Policy in Ancient India'. He cited epigraphic and literary evidence in order to show that the ancient Indian government was interested in the programme of agricultural development, for the requirements of the State had to be met with the surplus produce of the land realised as revenue. He drew attention to the benevolent activities of the ancient Indian rulers. Dr. S. R. Das wanted to know the purpose of the paper. Prof. Sircar replied that Dr. Chatterjee wanted to show that the ancient Indian rulers undertook works of public utility, although the fact is quite well known. Dr. Chatterjee said that he wanted to throw light on the State's interest in the economic life of the people. Sri A. K. Chakravarti doubted the statement that Indian agriculture was totally dependent on irrigation. Dr. S. K. Mitra pointed out that land belonged to the State, though its ownership was vested in the farmers who had to

pay taxes. Prof. Sircar observed that the wages of the officers were paid not only in cash, but often also in corn raised at the royal farms and collected as tax from the tenants. He further observed that the origin of despotism is problematical. Prof. Sircar also said that irrigation was not always undertaken by the State and referred to South Indian inscriptions recording the excavation of or repairs to irrigation tanks by the rich people. Regarding the State's ownership of all land, Prof. Sircar said that it was more or less theoretical because permanent tenants could not be normally dispossessed of their land. He also pointed out that the *Śukranitisāra*, referred to by Dr. Chatterjee, is a late medieval production, supposed by some scholars to be a modern forgery.

Dr. A. N. Lahiri next read his paper entitled 'The Supposed Joint-kings and Sub-kings amongst Early Indo-Greek Rulers'. He referred to the practice of appointing the heir-apparent as joint king, which was common amongst the Indo-Greeks, Parthians and Scythians, some of them being joint-kings or sub-kings. Prof. Sircar observed that, owing to the lack of evidence, it is difficult to distinguish between a joint-king and a sub-king. He doubted the existence of 'joint-kings', i.e. more than one ruler enjoying the same supreme position. In this connection, Prof. Sircar pointed out that, among the Colas, many kings were joint-rulers, of whom one was a king and the other a sub-king. Dr. Ganguly and some other participants were also doubtful about Dr. Lahiri's conception. Dr. Ganguly did not agree with Dr. Lahiri that the same mint produced coins for several areas.

Dr. Mrs. Bela Lahiri read her paper entitled 'Non-monarchical Institutions and the Evidence of Coins'. She pointed out that the terms indicating tribal republics such as *Gaṇa*, *Janapada*, *Negama* and *Saṅgha* are found on the ancient coins. Prof. Sircar observed that it is difficult to distinguish between monarchical and non-monarchical clans only on the basis of the occurrence of the clan name on the coins. He pointed out that many Pallava and Kadamba kings used their clan name,

though they cannot be regarded as belonging to the Pallava and Kadamba republics. He also drew attention to the fact that the Licchavis of Bihar were republican, while those of Nepal were monarchical. Dr. A.N. Lahiri opined that the coins issued by one called *Rājan* should be regarded as monarchical issues. Dr. S. K. Mitra thought that *Rājan* should be taken as an honorific title, while Prof. Sircar referred to the *Mahārāja Mahāsenāpati* of the Yaudheya-gaṇa mentioned in the Bijaygarh inscription. Dr. K. K. Dasgupta asked whether Dr. Sm. Lahiri considered the terms *Saṁgha*, *Gaṇa*, etc., as synonymous. Prof. Sircar replied that it was very difficult to be sure whether these terms have identical sense.* He remarked that, India being a vast country, the meaning of the words may have differed in different places.

Prof. D. C. Sircar read his paper entitled 'Some Principles of Rājadharma'. He referred to a number of stanzas in Chapter 100 of the Ayodhyā-kāṇḍa of the *Rāmāyaṇa* and Chapter 5 of the Sabhā-parvan of the *Mahābhārata*, which are common. He pointed out that some of the common stanzas have not even variant readings. These, he said, were probably borrowed by the epics from the popular floating literature and embodied certain accepted principles of Rājadharma. Dr. Lahiri thought that the references to different spies not knowing one another

*[The following stanzas of Kātyāyana quoted in the *Daṇḍaviveka* (G. O. S., p. 31) suggest different meanings to the words; but the approach seems to be more or less theoretical and not really correct :

nānā-paura-samūhas=tu naigamaḥ parikīrtitaḥ|
nān-āyudha-bhṛto vrātāḥ sametāḥ parikīrtitāḥ||
samūho vaṇig-ādīnāṁ pūgaḥ saṁpatikīrtitaḥ|
pravrajy-āvasitā ye tu pāṣaṇḍās=tu udāhṛtāḥ||
Brāhmaṇānāṁ samūhas=tu gaṇaḥ saṁparikīrtitaḥ|
śilp-opajīvino ye te śreṇayaḥ parikīrtitāḥ||
Arhatāṁ Saugat-ādīnāṁ samūhaḥ saṅgha ucyate|
Cāṇḍāla-Śvapac-ādīnāṁ samūho gulma ucyate||
gaṇa-pāṣaṇḍa-pūgāś=ca vrātāś=ca śreṇayas=tathā|
samūhasthāś=ca ye c=ānye varg-ākhyās=te Bṛhaspatiḥ||

But the *Daṇḍaviveka* also quotes, *gulma* = *padāti-samūha* (Lakṣmīdhara) and *śreṇi* = *vaṇik-samūha* (Ratnākara).—Ed.]

in the stanzas discussed by Prof. Sircar were interesting. In reply to Sri B. P. Mishra, Prof. Sircar said that the 33 common stanzas in the epics may have been taken from earlier *gāthās*. Dr. Verma pointed out that the *Arthaśāstra* of Kauṭilya refers to spies against spies. He also said that the reference to preferring one wise man to thousands of fools suggests the exploitation of the common people by the intelligentsia. Prof. Sircar did not agree with this view.

Sri J. R. Haldar read his paper entitled 'Administrative System in Pali Literature'. Sm. S. Sengupta drew attention to Sri Haldar's mention of a king having the quality of an Arhat, while Dr. A. N. Lahiri observed that the Indo-Greek king Menander is said to have acquired this quality. Prof. Sircar said that Sri Haldar has discussed a big subject in a small paper.

Sri R. K. Billorey read his paper entitled 'Some Analogous Statements bearing on Rājadharma in the *Mahābhārata* and the Aśokan Inscriptions'. Prof. Sircar observed that the *Mahābhārata* in its present form could not have been known to Aśoka.

The last paper of the session entitled 'The Appointment of Spies and their Performance' was read by Sri A. K. Jha. Dr. A. N. Lahiri said that there was scope to improve upon the paper. Prof. Sircar observed that it is difficult to treat such a big subject in a small note. Moreover, he pointed out, most of the facts noted by Sri Jha are well known.

The afternoon session closed at 5 P.M.

At the conclusion of the deliberations of the Seminar, Prof. Sircar thanked all the participants who made the seminars of both the days a success. He expressed his thankfulness especially to those who had come from a distance and requested them to forgive the organisers for any inconvenience caused to them. The participants, in their turn, thanked the chair.

I

THE QUEEN IN THE NORTH INDIAN KINGDOMS DURING THE PRE-GUPTA PERIOD

D. K. Ganguly, Visva-Bharati University, Santiniketan

It is a matter of regret that the *Ṛgveda* hardly gives us any information about the queen. We have therefore no means to ascertain her status in the Ṛgvedic states. The queen, however, finds prominent mention in the later Vedic texts. It seems that, in this period, the king was usually allowed to have four[1] queens, the *Mahiṣī*,[2] *Parivṛktī*,[3] *Vāvātā* and *Pālāgalī*. Sāyaṇa, while explaining a passage of the *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*,[4] observes that the king had three wives, including the *Mahiṣī*, *Vāvātā* and *Parivṛktī*. This observation can hardly be correct, because it does not take any notice of the *Pālāgalī* who is mentioned in several texts as one of the royal consorts. Again, we cannot agree with Sāyaṇa when he says that the *Mahiṣī*, *Vāvātā* and *Parivṛktī* came from the higher, middle and lower castes respectively (*rājñāṁ hi trividhāḥ striyaḥ tatr=ottama-jāter= mahiṣ=īti nāma madhyama-jāter=vāvātā iti adhama-jāteḥ parivṛktīr=iti*). A passage of the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*[5] implies that the lady who was married to the king first was called the *Mahiṣī*, chief queen. The *Parivṛktī* was the discarded wife. She was relegated to such a neglected position on account of her barrenness.[6] The *Vāvātā* was the favourite wife while the *Pālāgalī* was the daughter of the last of the court officials.[7]

1 Macdonell and Keith, *Vedic Index*, Vol. I, p. 478.

2 The term *mahiṣī*, which literally means the chief queen, proves that the king used to have a plurality of wives.

3 She is called *Parivṛktā* in the *Ṛgveda* (X.102.11), *Atharvaveda* (VII. 113.2 ; XX. 128.10-11) and *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* (XIII. 2.6.6 ; 4.1.8 ; 5.2.7).

4 12.11.

5 VI. 5.3.1.

6 Jogiraj Basu (*India of the Age of the Brāhmaṇas*, p. 120) quotes from the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* the following passage : *aputrā vai patnī Parivṛktā*.

7 *Vedic Index*, Vol. I, p. 478.

The *Mahiṣī* was superior to the other queens. This is suggested, in the first place, by the fact that while the *Mahiṣī* is given the third position in almost all the lists of the *Ratnins*, the *Parivṛktī* is usually given the fourth position and the *Vāvātā* figures as a *Ratnin* only in the *Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa*. Again the description of the royal consecration and of the *Aśvamedha* sacrifice as given in the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* would indicate a higher status of the *Mahiṣī* than the other wives of the king. The *Mahiṣī* took an active part in the *Rājasūya* sacrifice. When the chariot race was over, the king, along with the *Mahiṣī*, used to ascend the sacrificial post and say, "We have become the children of Prajāpati" (*Prajāpateḥ prajā abhūma*).[8] Owing to her participation in the *Rājasūya*, the *Mahiṣī* became vested with a sort of divinity. The *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* tells us that, at the time of the *Aśvamedha* sacrifice, the chief queen was attended by one hundred princesses (*tasyai śataṁ rājaputryaḥ anucaryo bhavanti*);[9] the favourite queen was accompanied by a hundred women of royal descent (*tasyai śataṁ rājanyā anucaryo bhavanti*);[10] the *Parivṛktī* was followed by one hundred daughters of heralds and village headmen (*tasyai śataṁ sūta-grāmaṇyā duhitaro='nucaryo bhavanti*);[11] the *Pālāgalī* was escorted by one hundred daughters of chamberlains and charioteers (*tasyai śataṁ kṣātra-saṅgrahītṛṇāṁ duhitaro='nucaryo bhavanti*).[12] This clearly shows the respective position of the different queens.

What were the functions of these queens ? K. P. Jayaswal[13] thinks that the queens had no functions other than religious. In the Vedic period, women had to perfom sacrifices jointly with their husbands. The *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*[14] declares that, spiritually, man cannot be considered complete unless he is

8 *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*, 5.2.1.11.
9 *Ibid.*, 13.5.2.5.
10 *Ibid.*, 13.5.2.6.
11 *Ibid.*, 13.5.2.7.
12 *Ibid.*, 13,5.2.8.
13 *Hindu Polity*, p. 201.
14 I. 2.5.

accompanied by his wife (*tasmāt puruṣo jāyāṁ vittvā kṛtsnataram=iv=ātmānaṁ manyate*). The *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*[15] echoes the same feeling when it forbids the bachelor to offer oblations (*a-yaññyo v=aiṣa yo='patnīkaḥ*). The queen then, as a lifelong partner of her husband, co-operated with her lord in religious rites and ceremonies. The presence of the queens was necessary even at the time of the *Aśvamedha* sacrifice. When the horse would return from its journey, they washed the horse and decorated its body. The horse was next killed and laid on a blanket. The chief queen would lie by its side and the priest would cover both the queen and the horse with a piece of cloth. While lying thus the queen used to catch the genital organ of the animal and united with it. At the time the priest would utter the verse 'O horse, ejaculate your semen' (*aśvasya śiśnaṁ mahiṣī upasthe nidhatte vṛṣā vājī retodhā reto dadhātu iti*).[16] When the chief queen performed her rites, different priests indulged in conversing in abusive language with different female characters ; the *Brahman* conversed with the chief queen, the *Adhvaryu* with the attendants of the *Mahiṣī*, the *Udgātṛ* with the *Vāvātā*, the *Hotṛ* with the *Parivṛktī* and the *Kṣattṛ* with the *Pālāgalī*.[17]

But it would not be correct to hold that the activities of the queens were confined to religious matters alone. Jogiraj Basu[18] observes that the queens, particularly the favourite one, 'enjoyed an important position as a go-between between the king and his officers or the king and the people'. But there is hardly any evidence in the Vedic literature which would corroborate this contention. Further, it is quite unlikely that the people, particularly the commoners, had such direct relations with the queens. As *Ratnins* of the kingdom, the queens, no doubt, were entrusted with some administrative functions; but the details are not known.

15 V. 1.6.10.

16 *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*, 13.5.2.2.

17 For a detailed account of the *Aśvamedha* sacrifice, see *India of the Age of the Brāhmaṇas*, pp. 207-08.

18 *Ibid.*, p. 121.

We hardly meet with a trustworthy account of the queens in the Buddhist Jātakas ;[19] but the Classical authors appear to offer some genuine traditions about them. While referring to the Pāṇḍya kingdom, Megasthenes says, "Next come the Pandae, the only race in India ruled by women. They say that Hercules having but one daughter, who was on that account all the more beloved, endowed her with a noble kingdom. Her descendants rule over 300 cities and command an army of 150,000 foot and 500 elephants."[20] It appears from Megasthenes' accounts that, during his time, the Pāṇḍya country was ruled by a queen who exercised her authority over 300 villages and had under her control a powerful army. The use of the term women in plural by Megasthenes further implies that the rule of the queens was not an accidental phenomenon in the history of this country, but that queens ruled through generations.

The classical authors tell us about Kleophis, the queen of the Assakenoi in the Punjab. When the king of the Assakenoi died in course of fight with Alexander the Great, Kleophis took charge of the fortress of Massaga and fought gallantly before she was captured by the Macedonian army. Q. Curtius[21] says that, after the conclusion of the war, Alexander once again made her the ruler of her kingdom.[22] The same authority tells us that Kleophis afterwards gave birth to a son who bore the name of Alexander. The example of Kleophis would lead us to suggest that the queens of the Assakenoi were not mere consorts of their husbands, but faced with an adverse situation, they could rise to the occasion and display administrative and martial ability.

From Pillar Edict VII[23] we learn that the Maurya queens

19 [It is difficult to agree with the statement.—Ed.] One of the *Jātakas* (IV. p. 487) states that, when a king of Kāśi renounced the world, his queen, at the behest of the subjects, assumed the reins of administration.

20 *Ancient India as described by Megasthenes and Arrian*, pp. 150-51.

21 VIII. 10.

22 Smith, *Early History of India*, p. 55.

23 Basak, *Aśokan Inscriptions*, pp. 107ff.

were called *Devīs*. It says, *ete ca aṁne ca bahukā mukhā dāna-visagasi viyāpaṭā, se mama c=eva devinaṁ ca.*[24] R. G. Basak[25] translates the passage thus, "These and many other *mukhyas* (chiefs or heads of departments) are engaged in the distribution of charities and this too on my own behalf and that of my queens.' It is evident that Aśoka's queens not only bore the designation *Devī*, but that they had their private funds to make charities on their own account. In Pillar Edict VII,[26] we have *dālakānaṁ pi ca me kaṭe aṁnānaṁ ca devi-kumālānaṁ*, which R. G. Basak[27] renders into English as "I have also ordered this to be done with regard to my sons, and other princes born of the Queens." Now, it is almost certain that *dālakānaṁ* refers to the sons of Aśoka himself.[28] In this context we should not take the expression *devi-kumālānaṁ* as denoting the sons of Aśoka's queens. Bühler rightly points out that the *Devi-kumālas* were not the sons of Aśoka's queens, but of the queens of his father. We may accordingly conclude that during the period of Maurya rule the wives of both the reigning and dead kings were called *Devīs*.

The Maurya emperors were polygamists.[29] A study of the *Mahāvaṁsa*,[30] *Divyāvadāna*[31] and other texts[32] shows that Aśoka had the following queens :

1. Devī. She was married to Aśoka at Vidiśā, identified with Besnagar, and gave birth to Mahendra and Saṅghamitrā. The *Sāmantapāsādikā*[33] represents her as a Vaiśyā while the *Mahābodhivaṁsa*[34] describes her as *Vedisa-mahādevī* and *Sākyānī* (i.e., *Śākya-kumārī*).

24 *Ibid.*, p. 108.
25 *Ibid.*, p. 112.
26 *Ibid.*, p. 108.
27 *Ibid.*, p. 112.
28 B. M. Barua, *Aśoka and his Inscriptions*, p. 52.
29 *Ibid.*, pp. 51ff.
30 Eng. trans. *(The Great Chronicle of Ceylon)* by W. Geiger.
31 Ed. by E. B. Cowell and R. A. Neil, Cambridge, 1886.
32 This has been discussed at length by B. M. Barua in his *Aśoka and his Inscriptions*.
33 Barua, *op. cit.*, p. 51.
34 See pp. 98, 110.

2. Āsandhimitrā. The *Mahāvaṁsa* represents her as Aśoka's chief queen (*piyā aggamahisī*) who died in the twenty-sixth year after Aśoka's consecration.

3. Padmāvatī. She is mentioned in the *Divyāvadāna*[35] as the mother of Dharmavivardhana who became famous as Kuṇāla in later years.

4. Tiṣyarakṣitā. The *Divyāvadāna*[36] states that she was raised to the position of Aśoka's chief consort four years later than the death of Asandhimitrā.

To the above list of queens, we may add the name of Kāruvākī who is mentioned in one of Aśoka's edicts as his second queen. From the details given about Aśoka's queens, as gathered from several texts, the following facts emerge.

First, the first married wife of the king could not necessarily be anointed as the chief queen. Āsandhimitrā became the chief consort, though Aśoka married Devī first.*

Secondly, the chief queen was called *Aggamahisī*. Here we notice a discrepancy in the accounts between the epigraphic and literary evidence, for inscriptions imply that the chief queen was called *Prathama-devī*,** as may be guessed from the expression *dutiyāye deviye* used in relation to Kāruvākī.

Thirdly, the post of the chief queen did not remain vacant for long. When the chief consort died, another queen was selected for that post within a short period of time.

Fourthly, it seems that there were several establishments for individual wives at different places. The Pāli texts tell us that Devī did not accompany the emperor to Pāṭaliputra, but continued to stay at Vidiśā. The testimony of the Pāli texts about the separate establishment of different queens at different places appears to be corroborated by the inscriptional evidence. The Queen's Edict suggests that Kāruvākī had her residence at Kauśāmbī.** That many of Aśoka's queens did not live with

35 XXVII.

36 *Loc. cit.*

*[The conclusion is not sound because it is based on a tradition of dubious value.—Ed.]

**[This is merely an unproved guess.—Ed.]

him at Pāṭaliputra, but stayed at different places is proved by the following statement in P. E. VII : "In all my harems, they become acquainted in many ways with all the [proper] objects where satisfaction is to be arranged, here [in the capital] and in the [different] quarters [of the country]."[37]

The information about the Maurya queens supplied to us by the edicts of Aśoka and Buddhist legends is, however, by no means complete, and for further details we may turn to the *Arthaśāstra*. Kauṭilya includes the queen mother and the chief queen in the first grade of officials who received 48,000 *paṇas* as their remuneration. He warns the king not to place too much confidence in his queen and advises him to visit her 'after she is cleared [of suspicion] by old women'. He cites a few cases of treachery on the part of queens. The Kāśi monarch was killed by his queen who served him poisonous fried grain under the name of honey ; the king Vairantya was killed by his queen by means of an anklet smeared with poison ; Vidūratha was murdered by his queen who kept a weapon concealed in the braid of her hair. Kauṭilya[38] lays down that the king should keep the queens under strict vigil. He says, "He should forbid [the queen's] contact with ascetics with shaven heads or matted hair and with jugglers as well as with female slaves from outside. No members of their families should visit these queens except in establishments for maternity and sickness." Under such circumstances the queen, as depicted by Kauṭilya, hardly enjoyed a scope to participate in public life and administration.

Vasiṣṭha[39] who is generally assigned by scholars to an earlier epoch, says that the queen mother should receive maintenance and the other queens of the deceased king should

37 Basak, *Aśokan Inscriptions*, p. 112. The original text reads: *savasi ca me olodhanasi te bahuvidhena ākālena tāni tāni tuṭhāyatanāni paṭipādyanti hida e=eva disāsu ca.*

38 I.xx.18.

39 XIX.30 ; XIX.33 ; G. Bühler, *The Sacred Laws of the Āryas*, Vol. II (1965), p. 100.

receive food and raiment, but that they may depart according to their wishes.

That the queens wielded enormous influence in the Indo-Greek principalities in the north-western part of India is evidenced by coins. Numismatic evidence suggests that Menander considered himself to be the husband of the goddess Athena whose figure appears on some of his coins. But the goddess is represented in the form of his queen Agathocleia. This shows how greatly Agathocleia was honoured by her husband.[40] But it was after the death of her husband that she got an opportunity to demonstrate her skill as an administrator. The so-called joint issues of Agathocleia and her son Strato I, which contain the portrait of Agathocleia alone, show that they were issued at a time when Agathocleia held the reins of administration as regent for her minor son after the death of her husband Menander. She assumed the title 'god-like' on coins.[41] The period of her regency continued for long as may be inferred from her second series of coins which shows jugate busts of herself and Strato I.[42]

The case of Laodice who was the mother of Eucratides also deserves consideration. Eucratides issued a series of coins on which figure his parents Heliocles and Laodice. Laodice, to judge from her name, was a Seleucid princess, and if the theory of Tarn[43] is accepted, she was a daughter of Seleucus II and sister of Antiochus III. On the coins, Laodice wears diadem while her husband is found bare-headed. The use of diadem, the symbol of royal power, by Laodice may

---

40 Several Greek and Roman rulers claim to have wedded goddesses. Antiochus IV wedded Atargatis, Antony married Isis (*GBI*, p. 265) and so on.

41 *Corolla Numismatica*, 1906, p. 245.

42 *Loc. cit.*; *Cambridge History of India*, Vol. I, p. 553. It has been suggested by some scholars that Agathocleia was the queen of Strato I. The similarity of names and coin types indicates that she was the sister or daughter of the Indo-Greek king Agathocles (*The Age of Imperial Unity*, pp. 113-14).

43 *The Greeks in Bactria and India*, p. 177.

lead us to surmise that she was the real mistress of the satrapy with which her husband was associated either as the general or as the governor.

Attention may further be drawn to some silver pieces on which Hermaeus and Calliope appear side by side, both wearing the diadem. This shows that Calliope who was related to Hippostratus of the Euthydemid family, as was suggested by Tarn,[44] was a queen in her own right and it seems quite likely that, although corroborative evidence is not forthcoming, she shouldered the administrative responsibilities jointly with her husband who was the last descendant of Eucratides.

Our knowledge of the queens of the Scytho-Parthian and Kuṣāṇa kingdoms is extremely meagre. When the Parthian king Mithridates I died in 138-137 B. C. his queen Ri . mu acted as the regent for his young son Phraates II.[45] But our sources do not disclose the existence of a Ri . mu in any Parthian kingdom in India proper.

The evidence of the *Rāmāyaṇa* and the *Mahābhārata* may be utilised as reflecting the condition of India during the period between the fourth century B.C. and the fourth century A. D. which witnessed the final composition of the epics. There are a few passages in the epics which show that, at the time of emergency, women were allowed to ascend the throne. Book II of the *Rāmāyaṇa*[46] states that there was a proposal to place Sītā on the throne when Rāma was banished to the forest (*ātmā hi dārāḥ sarveṣāṁ dāra-saṅgrahavartināṁ/ ātm=eyam=iti Rāmasya pālayiṣyati medinīm*). Book XII[47] of the *Mahābhārata* implies that, in the absence of any male heir, women were offered the throne (*kumāro n=āsti yeṣāṁ kanyās=tatr=ābhiṣecaya*). It is to be remembered in this connection that the *Mahābhārata*, in a different context,[48] condemns the rule of women (*yatra strī*

44 *Ibid.*, p. 337.

45 A. T. Clay, *Babylonian Records in the Library of J. Pierpont Morgan*, Vol. II, p. 53.

46 II. 37.38.

47 XII. 32.33.

48 V. 38.92.

yatra kitavo bālo yatr=ānuśāsitā | majjanti te='vaśā rājan= nadyām=aplavā iva).

The epics portray that kings were respectful to their queens. It is stated that the king should take care of his queen as his mother and worship her as his elder sister *(iyaṁ hi naḥ priyā bhāryā prāṇebhyo='pi garīyasī| māt=eva paripālyā ca pūjyā jyeṣṭh=eva svasā.*[49] Still the well-known example of Yudhiṣṭhira staking Draupadi in the gambling hall may suggest that tl e husband was considered to have had a proprietary right in the wife. The *Mahābhārata* shows the prevalence of the custom of levirate in the royal harem. When the kings were physically unfit, the queens were asked by their husbands to have children with the help of other persons, according to the *niyoga* system. Dhṛtarāṣṭra and Pāṇḍu were born to Vicitravīrya as a result of such union of his queens Ambikā and Ambālikā with Kṛṣṇa-Dvaipāyana. Mādrī gave birth to her sons through the grace of the twin Aśvins. We, however, cannot say definitely whether the *niyoga* marriage was current among any of the royal families in India during the period between the fourth century B. C. and the fourth century A. D.

While referring to the qualifications of the queen, Manu[50] points out that she should be of equal caste *(varṇa)* and be born in a great family. She should possess auspicious marks on her body and charm and other excellent qualities. Manu does not encourage the king to consult the queen in matters of government as would be clear from his following observations : "At the time of consultation, let him cause to be removed idiots, the dumb, the blind and the deaf, animals, very aged men, women, the sick, and those deficient in limbs. [Such] despicable [persons], likewise animals and particularly women betray secret counsel, for that reason he must be careful with respect to them."[51] Manu recommends women to inherit some kinds of property. If this right of inheritance, as suggested

49 IV. 3.17. [The quotations are not all strictly accurate.—Ed.]

50 VII. 77.

51 G. Bühler, *Laws of Manu*, p. 239.

by Manu, applies to all classes of women, then it may be held that queens had their own property which consisted of the gifts given by parents and brothers at any time, gifts of affection given by husbands after marriage, and presents given by anybody either at the time of marriage or when they are taken to their new home.[52] It may be mentioned that, to the above six varieties of *strīdhana*, Viṣṇu[53] adds three more categories, including the gifts given by the son or any other relative and the compensation given to the wife at the time of her supersession on the occasion of her husband's second marriage.[54]

It would thus appear from what has been said above that the authors of the epics were more liberal to queens and women than Kauṭilya and Manu.* The epic queens enjoyed a greater amount of freedom. They advised the king on matters of government and in the absence of any male heir they even ascended the throne. But the *Arthaśāstra* would leave the impression that the movements and activities of queens were strictly restricted even within the bounds of the places. It is interesting to note in this connection that Pāṇini,[55] whose date is variously estimated between the seventh and fourth centuries B. C., has used the expression *asūryampaśyā*. The commentators have generally interpreted the term to mean queens *(rājadārāḥ)*. If this interpretation is accepted, it would follow that Pāṇini knew of the royal ladies 'who lived in the seclusion of the palace where they could not see even the sun'.

---

52 Manu, IX.194.

53 XVII.18.

54 Yājñavalkya gives a more extended list of *strīdhana—pitṛ-mātṛ-pati-bhrātṛ-dattam=adhyagny-upāgatam/ādhivedanik-ādyaṁ=ca strīdhanaṁ parikīrtitam* (II. 143); *bandhu-dattaṁ tathā śulkam=anvādheyakam=eva vā/atītāyām=aprajasi bāndhavās=tad=avāpnuyuḥ* (II. 144).

*[This is not quite correct. Views like those of Manu and even more drastic ones are also reflected in the *Mahābhārata*. See Hopkins, in *JAOS*, Vol. XIII, 1888, pp. 350ff., 366. Cf. Calcutta reprint, *The Status of Woman*, ed. Sircar, pp. 53ff., 77.—Ed.]

55 V. S. Agrawala, *India as Known to Pāṇini*, p. 405. [This is wrong.—Ed.]

934
Ea76
C5
RCU 3750

II

RĀJADHARMA IN THE MAHĀBHĀRATA AND THE AŚOKAN INSCRIPTIONS

Ramesh Kumar Billorey, Centre of Advanced Study
in AIHC, Calcutta University

The administration of the Maurya rulers including Aśoka is believed to have been based on the *Arthaśāstra* of Kauṭilya which, in its turn, appears to be indebted to the *Mahābhārata*.[1] Aśoka, generally speaking, showed no disregard for the sacred tradition as recorded in the law-books. He revived, in most cases, the old practices and enforced the regulations which had fallen into disuse,[2] though the royal sage also introduced a few innovations such as the granting of three days respite to prisoners on whom the sentence of death had been passed.[3] In PE VII, which refers to his benevolent activities, Aśoka says, "Mankind has been blessed with many such comforts by former kings as well as by myself."[4] It is natural, therefore, that some of the passages in the Sabhā and Śānti Parvans of the Great Epic, relating to Rājadharma, find their echo in the edicts of Aśoka.

The *Mahābhārata* advises the king to have a paternal, affectionate attitude towards the people. Protection of the people in the widest sense, material and moral alike, is the primary function of the government and the very essence of

1 V. R. R. Dikshitar, *The Mauryan Polity*, Madras, 1953, pp. 13, 86, 98-121. In the paternal conception of government and in other relevant matters, e.g., moral and material welfare of the people, *utthāna* or exertion of the king, enforcing of *svadharma*, protection of life and property, promotion of arts, education, agriculture, and commerce, works of public utility, proper administration of justice, etc., Kauṭilya appears to be indebted to the *Mahābhārata*. See *ibid.*, pp. 98-121.

2 *Ibid.*, p. 92.

3 D. C. Sircar, *Inscriptions of Aśoka*, 2nd ed., p. 73.

4 *Ibid.*, p. 76.

403433

kingship.[5] He should strike the balance between strictness and mildness.[6] The righteous should be rewarded and the wicked punished. The epic lays down that the king must not discriminate and be impartial.[7] Justice is considered to be the very basis of the stability of the government. While no offender, however dear to the king, should escape punishment, none should be punished for the fault of another.[8] The king should not only promote the material interests of the people, but also foster righteousness and look after the moral welfare of his wards.

He should make the earth habitable and comfortable for men by undertaking various acts of public utility.[9] The epic inculcates charity on the part of the king and instructs that the Brāhmaṇas and wise men should be well cared for. The women and destitutes should be protected.[10] The government should be efficient. Energy is considered one of the prime requisites of the king. Everything can be acquired by exertion.[11] The king should be accessible to all. He must personally dispose of the most important transactions of the government.[12] As will be seen below, these statements in the *Mahābhārata* have their striking parallels in the Aśokan edicts.

Aśoka acknowledged the traditional debt a king owed to his subjects, i.e. affording them protection in return for the taxes paid by the latter.[13] He treated his subjects of all sects and communities as his own children and desired to provide them all kinds of welfare and happiness in this world and in

5 Beni Prasad, *The Theory of Government in Ancient India*, 1st ed., p. 40. The *Rgveda* calls him 'the protector of the people'. The idea of protection as embodying the supreme function of royalty or government runs through the whole of Indian political speculation. See *Ibid.*, p. 18.

6 *Ibid.*, p. 41.

7 *Ibid.*, p. 44.

8 *Loc. cit.*

9 *Ibid.*, pp. 45-46.

10 *Ibid.*, p. 46.

11 *Loc. cit.*

12 *Loc. cit.*

13 D. C. Sircar, *op. cit.*, pp. 23-24.

the next.[14] He made it clear to the forest folk that, in spite of his repentance he possessed 'power enough to punish them for their crimes, so that they should turn away from evil ways...'.[15] He advised the judicial officers to act with impartiality.[16] He left the award of rewards and the infliction of punishment to the discretion of the governors of the districts in order to ensure impartiality in judicial proceedings.[17] The works of public utility undertaken by Aśoka are well known.[18] He also realised that the welfare of all men was difficult to accomplish without utmost exertion.[19] He attended to people's affairs at all times and places. In the course of his pilgrimages, he visited the Brāhmaṇas and Śramaṇas and made gifts to them, met the aged and made provision of money for them and contacted the people of countryside and instructed them in Dharma.[20] Above all, general harmony between people of different sects and communities is emphasised in the epic as in the Aśokan edicts,[21] and the king is supposed to make an effort in that direction.

14 RE XV-XVI (see Sircar, *op. cit.*, pp. 61-63).
15 RE XIII (*ibid.*, p. 58).
16 RE XIII, XVI (*ibid.*, pp. 58, 63).
17 PE IV (*ibid.*, pp. 72-73).
18 RE II, PE VII (*ibid.*, pp. 46-47, 76).
19 RE VI (*ibid.*, pp. 50-51).
20 RE VIII (*ibid.*, p. 52).
21 RE XII (*ibid.*, pp. 55-56). See Beni Prasad, *op. cit.*, p. 33.

III

NON-MONARCHICAL INSTITUTIONS AND THE EVIDENCE OF COINS

Sm. Bela Lahiri, Jadavpur University

The high antiquity of the non-monarchical form of government in India is recognised by all scholars. Pāṇini in the fifth century B. C. refers to *saṁghas* and divides them into two classes : (1) the *āyudha-jīvin* and (2) others.[1] The Buddhist literature refers to a number of oligarchical clans which existed during the time of the Buddha.[2] Alexander's historians also testify to the existence of many aristocratic and oligarchic states in the Punjab and Sind regions at the time of his invasion.[3] Kauṭilya devotes a whole chapter on the *saṁghas* and divides them into two classes : (1) *vārtā-śastr-opajīvin* and (2) *rāja-śabd-opajīvin*, the former probably corresponding to the *āyudha-jīvin* of Pāṇini.[4]

With the progress of Magadhan imperialism, however, most of the autonomous states were incorporated into the Maurya empire. The monarchical tradition became so deep-rooted into the heart of the empire that, even after the downfall of the Mauryas, Madhyadeśa gave rise to petty kingdoms of monarchical constitution. But far away from the capital, in the hilly districts of the Punjab and the deserts of Rajasthan, republican tradition survived, fostered by geographical isolation.* Numismatic evidence shows that it was mainly in

1 Cf. K. P. Jayaswal, *Hindu Polity (HP)*, Part I, p. 30 ; and R. C. Majumdar, *Corporate Life in Ancient India*, 3rd ed. *(CLAI)*, Ch. III.2, pp. 213-15.

2 Cf. *CLAI*, Ch. III.3, pp. 216-34.

3 *Ibid.*, Ch. III.4, pp. 235-38. [The expression *vārtā-śastr-opajīvin* refers to corporations of cultivators, traders, cattle-rearers and soldiers.—Ed.]

4 Kangle, *The Kauṭilīya Arthaśāstra*, Ch. XI *(Saṁgha-vṛttam)*, pp. 244ff.

*[The Licchavis appear to have continued to flourish in Bihar till the fourth century A.D.—Ed.]

these regions that various tribal oligarchical states grew up in the post-Maurya period.

The terms *gaṇa*, *janapada* and *nigama*, which occur in the coin-legends of this period, are also known from Pāṇini, Kātyāyana, Kauṭilya, and the *Mahābhārata*, and are recognised as forms of political organisations (*saṁgha*).[5] *Saṁgha*, as has been pointed out, was used by Pāṇini and others to denote a republic as opposed to a monarchy, and *gaṇa*, which was often used as a synonym for *saṁgha*, sometimes signified a particular kind, and the best-known form, of *saṁgha*.[6] On the other hand, the political character of *saṁgha* as used by Pāṇini, has been questioned by others. *Saṁgha*, according to them, denoted only a League or Confederacy of tribes, not necessarily of a political nature.[7]

Even if there is any scope for doubt about the exact significance of the term *saṁgha*, as it occurs in early Pāṇinian literature, there can be no doubt that the expression *gaṇa* denoted a political corporation. The passage in the *Avadāna-śataka* (No. 88) clearly distinguishes between countries ruled by kings and those ruled by *gaṇas*, and the term *gaṇa* here cannot but signify the non-monarchical form of government.[8] The character of *gaṇa* as a popular government is clearly demonstrated by Section 107 (verses 6ff.) of the Śānti-parvan of the *Mahābhārata*.[9] The Allahabad pillar inscription of Samudragupta also distinguishes the tribal states of the Mālavas, Ārjunāyanas, Yaudheyas and others from those ruled

5 Cf. D. R. Bhandarkar, *Carmichael Lectures*, 1918, pp. 140ff.; K. P. Jayaswal, *HP*, Ch. IV; and R. C. Majumdar, *CLAI*, Ch. III. See for Pāṇini and Kātyāyana, *HP*, Ch. V, for Kauṭilya, *ibid.*, Ch. VII, and for the *Mahābhārata*, *ibid.*, Ch. XIV.

6 *Carmichael Lectures*, 1918, pp. 146 and 149; *HP*, Pt. I, pp. 27-28, 33-34.

7 Cf. K. M. Shembavnekar, *An. Bhand. Or. Res. Inst.*, Vol. XXV, pp. 137ff.

8 Cf. *CLAI*, p. 216.

9 Cf. *HP*, Pt. I, pp. 125ff., 191ff.; and *CLAI*, pp. 247ff.

by kings.[10] The coins issued in the name of the Mālava-gaṇa or Yaudheya-gaṇa testify to the political character of these *gaṇas*.

According to Jayaswal, *gaṇa* means 'number' and *gaṇa-rājya* denotes 'government by an assembly or parliament'.[11] *Gaṇa*, however, could not have meant a republic in the modern sense of the term, since the representative system of government was not known even in ancient Greece, the cradle of democracy. In its ancient connotation, the word republic denoted government by a group of persons, more or less numerous, and it might take the form of oligarchy, aristocracy or democracy.[12] *Gaṇa* was a republic in this sense. Membership of the assembly of *gaṇa* seems to have been confined mainly to the Kṣatriya or ruling caste, and it is not clear if non-Kṣatriyas had any real share in the government.[13] The Śānti-parvan (Ch. 107, vv. 23-26) of the *Mahābhārata* as well as Kauṭilya's *Arthaśāstra* indicates that there was a smaller executive body of the *gaṇa*, consisting of the *gaṇa-mukhyas* or *saṅgha-mukhyas* who were to deal with matters requiring secret deliberations, and were 'to pursue that course of action which was approved by the members of the *saṅgha*', i.e. the general assembly.[14] It thus appears that *saṅgha-gaṇa* in the political sense was a tribal oligarchy or aristocracy, in which sovereignty was vested in a smaller body of *gaṇa-mukhyas* (cabinet ?), who were usually of the *Rājanya* or Kṣatriya order, and who were probably responsible to the general assembly of the *gaṇa*.

The respective legends on some Mālava and Yaudheya coins, viz., *Mālava-gaṇasya jayaḥ* and *Yaudheya-gaṇasya jayaḥ*,[15] show that these two tribes developed the *gaṇa* or

10 D. C. Sircar, *Select Inscriptions*, p. 258, text line 22.

11 *HP*, Pt. I, pp. 26-27.

12 Cf. A. S. Altekar, *State and Government in Ancient India (SGAI)*, p. 112.

13 Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 113-15.

14 Cf. *CLAI*, pp. 249 (text) and 251 (trans.) for the *Mahābhārata* passage, and *ibid.*, p. 241 for Kauṭilya.

15 *Catalogue of the Coins in the Indian Museum, Calcutta (IMC)*, Vol.

republican constitution. The powerful state to the east of the Beas, as referred to by Alexander's historians, in which 'the multitude was governed by the aristocracy, who exercised their authority with justice and moderation', has been recognised as that of the Yaudheyas.[16] The Greek historians add that, in that state, government was vested in a council of 5000 persons, each of whom had to present an elephant to the state.[17] The Yaudheya republic thus appears to have been governed by a rich aristocracy. Since the Yaudheyas were renowned as warriors, the ruling body must have consisted of the warrior caste. They belonged to the category of *āyudha-jīvin* of Pāṇini or *vārtā-śastr-opajīvin* of Kauṭilya.

Although the legend on the Ārjunāyana coins, viz. *Ārjunāyanānāṁ jayaḥ*, does not specifically refer to the *gaṇa*, it is in the nature of those on the Mālava and Yaudheya coins.[18] And since the Ārjunāyanas are mentioned along with the Mālavas and Yaudheyas in the Allahabad *praśasti*, they also appear to have formed a *gaṇa* or republican government.

In some of the republics, the *gaṇa-mukhyas*, who belonged to the Rājanya or ruling caste, were allowed the title of *Rājan*,[19] and Kauṭilya probably refers to such republics, when he distinguishes the *rājaśabd-opajīvins* from the *vārtā-śastr-opajīvins*. In some such cases, power seems to have been concentrated in the person of the President of the executive council of the *gaṇamukhyas*. The position of the President thus becomes analogous to that of a ruling king and coins were issued in his name with full royal title, along with the name of the tribe. Thus, the Punjab tribes like the Audumbaras, Vemakis, Kuṇindas and Kulūtas had their coins issued in the names of their respective tribal chiefs, viz. *Rājan* Audumbari Dhara-

I, p. 173, No. 58, Pl. XX.21 (Mālava) and *Catalogue of Ancient Indian Coins in the British Museum (BMC, AI)*, p. 276, Pl. XL.1 (Yaudheya).

16 McCrindle, *Invasion of Alexander the Great*, p. 121 ; cf. Jayaswal, *HP*, Pt. I, pp. 66-67, note 1.

17 McCrindle, *op. cit.*, p. 121.

18 *BMC(AI)*, p. 121, Pl. XIV.11.

19 Cf. Altekar, *op. cit*, pp. 113-14.

ghoṣa,[20] *Rājan* Vaimaki Rudravarman, [21] *Mahārāja* Kauṇinda Amoghabhūti,[22] and *Rājan* Kaulūta Vīrayaśas.[23] It is interesting, however, that the legend on Amoghabhūti's coins, which reads *Rājña*[*ḥ*] *Kuṇiṁdasa Amoghabhūtisa Mahārājasa*, includes two royal titles, *mahārāja* and *rājan*. This may indicate that Amoghabhūti was not only a *rājan* (i.e. one of the *gaṇa-mukhyas*), but also held the superior position of the foremost amongst the *rājans* and was hence distinguished by the loftier title of *Mahārāja* or 'great king'.[24]

According to Allan's reading, the legend on the unique Vṛṣṇi coin *(Vṛṣṇi-rājajñā-gaṇasya trātārasya)*[25] refers to the *gaṇa* of the Vṛṣṇis, who are also known from the *Arthaśāstra* to have adopted a *saṁgha* or republican form of government.[26] The term *rājajñā* is taken to be a mistake for *rājanya*, meaning thereby the *gaṇa* of the Vṛṣṇi-rājanyas, i.e. the Kṣatriya *gaṇa-mukhyas* of the Vṛṣṇi tribe, styled as *rājanyas*. Some other scholars, however, read the legend as *Vṛṣṇi-rāja-Jñāgaṇasya trātārasya*, thus taking Jñāgaṇa as the name of a Vṛṣṇi chief.[27] In that case, the Vṛṣṇis would have a *rājaśabdin* type of republic like the Audumbaras and others.

---

20 *Mahadevasa raña Dharaghoṣasa Oḍu*[*ṁ*]*barisa* : *BMC(AI)*, pp. lxxxiv and 124, Pl. XIV.14.

21 *Raña Vamakisa Rudravarmasa vijayaya* (*ibid.*, pp. lxxxv and 125, Pl. XIV.13).

22 *Rājñaḥ Kuṇiṁdasa*(or *sya*) *Amoghabhūtisa*(or *sya*) *mahārājasa*(or *sya*) (*ibid.*, pp. ci and 159, Pl. XXII.1).

23 *Vīrayaśasya rājña Kolūtasya* (*ibid.*, pp. c and 158, Pl. XVI,4 ; also *JRAS*, 1900, p. 420).

24 For various interpretations of the legend on the Kuṇinda coins, see Allan, *BMC(AI)*, p. cii ; Smith, *IMC*, p. 161 ; P. L. Gupta, *Indian Historical Quarterly* (*IHQ*), Vol. XXVII, p. 204 ; and Jai Prakash, *Journal of the Numismatic Society of India (JNSI)*, Vol. XXVII, p. 126. Allan points out the importance which is given to the word *Mahārāja* by assigning it the place where the name of the king occurs on the Indo-Greek coins.

25 *BMC(AI)*, pp. clv and 281, Pl. XVI.5.

26 *Arthaśāstra*, I.6, 10 (Kangle, p. 8) ; cf. *HP*, Pt. I, pp. 39, 40 and note 2.

27 S. K. Chakrabortty, *Numismatic Supplement*, No. XLVI, p. 87. D. C. Sircar also accepts this.

As seen above, the *rājaśabdin* type of republic is apparently undistinguishable from a monarchy, since the Head of the state in both cases adopt the royal title. But in the case of the Head or President of a republic who is styled as *Rājan* or *Mahārāja*, the office seems to have been an elective one, while in the case of a regular monarchy, the office of the Head or king was hereditary. Thus, the Vijayagarh inscription refers to a Yaudheya chief styled as *Mahārāja* and *Mahāsenāpati* who was elected as such by the *Yaudheya-gaṇa (Yaudheya-gaṇa-puraskṛtaḥ)*.[28] In the case of some other republics, however, although the post of the tribal chief became hereditary, he was not still allowed the royal title. The Nandsa *yūpa* inscriptions of the Kṛta year 282 (224 A.D.) refer to a Mālava chief (Nandisoma ?), who regained the independence of his country (from foreign rule) and performed the *Ekaṣaṣṭhirātra* sacrifice, but was not given any royal title like *Rājan* and *Mahārāja*, although his family claimed descent from the famous royal race of the Ikṣvākus and enjoyed the military headship of the state for at least three generations.[29] Another Nandsa inscription refers to a Mālava chief Bhaṭṭisoma as *Mahāsenāpati*.[30] A *yūpa* inscription from Barnala (Jaipur District) dated in the year 284 (226 A.D.),[31] however, speaks of a chief (whose name ends in *vardhana*), who was the son of a king and himself adopted a royal title and performed seven *Soma* sacrifices *(sapta-Soma-saṁsthā)*. These Mālava chiefs belonged to different families, which were probably different sub-clans of the Mālavas.[32]

The term *janapada* in its literal sense signifies a country and does not therefore indicate any form of government. But since coins were issued in the names of the *janapadas* like those of

28 *CII*, Vol. III, p. 251 ; *Ind. Ant.*, Vol. XIV, p. 8.

29 *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. XXVII, pp. 252ff. ; and *IHQ*, Vol. XXIX, pp. 80ff.

30 *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. XXVII, p. 266.

31 *Ibid.*, Vol. XXVI, pp. 118ff.

32 Nandisoma and Bhaṭṭisoma belonged to the Sogi clan, while the chief of the Barnala inscription was of the Sohartṛ *gotra*.

CALCUTTA CENTRAL

the Agratyas,[33] Rājanyas,[34] Trigartas[35] and Vemakis[36] of the Punjab region and Śibis of Madhymikā near Chitor,[37] it may be presumed that sovereignty in those tribal states rested in some sort of a corporate body and not in a king.* The *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa* passage (VII. 3.14) which ascribes a *Vairājya* constitution to some of the *janapadas* of the Himalayan region, viz. Uttara-Kuru and Uttara-Madra, etc., shows that *janapada* here is used in the sense of a republican state, for it is mentioned in opposition to *abhiṣikta*, i.e. anointed king.[38] The expression *vairājya* (kingless state), applied to the northern *janapadas*, is also significant, since it was mainly in the Punjab region that various forms of republican government developed.

The actual form of the republic is not, however, indicated by the term *janapada*, which might also have a *gaṇa* type of government. Thus, a lead stamp and seal of about the second century B.C. from Rairh in the former Jaipur State refers to the Mālava *janapada*,[39] while Mālava coins of a later period show that the Mālavas had a *gaṇa* state. Again, while the earlier coins of the Vemakis were issued in the name of the *janapada*, the later ones bore the name of the tribal chief *Rājan* Rudravarman, which shows that the Vemaki *janapada* in course of time developed as a *rājaśabdin* republic.

Some coins mention the name of the *janapada* along with that of the tribe, which help us to locate the mint where the coins were struck. Thus, the coins of the Agratya *janapada*

33 *Agodakā Agāca-janapadasa* (*BMC*[*AI*], pp. clviii and 283, Pl. XLV.24).

34 *Rājaña-janapadasa* (*ibid.*, pp. cxxiii and 210, Pl. XXIX.15).

35 *Trakaṭa-janapadasa* (*ibid.*, pp. cxl and 212, Pl. XXIX.10).

36 *Va(Ve)maka-*[*ja**]*napadasa* (*ibid.*, pp. cliv and 280, Pl. XLV.14).

37 *Majhamikāya Śibi-janapadasa* (*ibid.*, pp. cxxiv and 213, Pl. XLIV.6).

*[See D. R. Bhandarkar, *Anc. Ind. Num.*, reprint, Part I, pp 4-5. The word *janapada* is not recognised in such a sense in the lexicons and in literary works. See below how the territory of the Mālava-gaṇa is called a *janapada*. –Ed.]

38 Cf. *HP*, Pt. I, p. 92 and note 3 ; and *CLAI*, pp. 211-12. [We do not agree with this view.—Ed.]

39 K. N. Puri, *Excavations at Rairh*, pp. 49 and 54, Pl. XXVI.1-5.

were issued from Agrodaka (Agroha in the Hissar District of the Punjab) and those of the Śibi *janapada*, from Madhyamikā near Chitor. In like manner, some early Yaudheya coins were issued from the Bahudhānyaka mint (Rohtak District, Punjab).[40]

As to the term *Negamā* occurring on some coins, it is derived from *Nigama*, i.e. 'association of city-merchants' or 'trade-guild'.[41] Since some *naigamas* also issued coins, it appears that the city administration was carried on by an autonomous body which delegated the authority of issuing coins to the trade-guilds. Thus, the different *naigamas* of the Taxila region struck coins in their names, probably with some sort of co-ordination from a central body.[42] Similarly, certain *naigamas* and *gāndhikas* of Kauśāmbī had their own coins before the dynastic issues were current there.[43]

Certain other coins bearing the names of cities like Vārāṇasī, Kauśāmbī, Erakiṇa, Vidiśā, Tripurī, Māhiṣmatī, Ujjayinī, etc., may be referred to in this connection.[44] These were probably the issues of city-corporations, indicating some sort of autonomy for the cities.

Some coins, again, reveal the existence of a sort of theocracy in which the state is dedicated to its presiding deity, probably in times of national crisis. Thus, coins issued in the names of the Yaudheya war-god Brahmaṇyadeva or Kārtti-

40 The legend on these coins is *Yaudheyāna[ṁ] Bahudhañake* (*BMC[AI]* pp. cxlviii and 267, Pl. XXIX.11). [Hissar and Rohtak are now in Hariana. —Ed.]

41 Cf. *ibid.*, pp. cxxvi and cxxx.

42 Cf. also the coins with the legend *Pañchanekame*, i.e. 'association of five guilds' (*ibid.*, pp. cxxvii-cxxx).

43 For coins with the legend *Nagama*, see *JNSI*, Vol. XXIV, p. 23; Vol. XXVIII, p. 209; and for those with the legend *Gadhikana*, *ibid.*, Vol. XXV, p. 19; Vol. XXVII, p. 84; Vol. XXVIII, pp. 45, 153.

44 See *JNSI*, Vol. XII, pp. 134-35, Pl. XI. 5-6 (*Vārāṇasī*); *BMC(AI)*, pp. xcviii-xcix (*Kosa[ṁ]bi*); pp. xci-xcii, (*Erakaṇya*); *JNSI*, Vol. XXIII, p. 307 (*Vedisa*); *BMC(AI)*, p. 239, Pl. XXXV.14 (*Tripuri*); *JNSI*, Vol. XV, pp. 70ff.; Vol. XVII, Pt. 2, pp. 94ff., Pl. VIII.5-7 (*Mahisati*); and *BMC(AI)*, p. 262, Pl. XXXVII.15 (*Ujeni*). [*Erakaṇya* = *Airakiṇyāḥ*, 'from Airakiṇi.—Ed.]

keya,[45] the Kuṇinda coins with the name of god Catreśvara Śiva,[46] and some unassignable coins bearing the name of god Mahādeva [47] suggest that the administration in those states, for a period, was probably carried on in the name of the respective tribal gods.

45 The legend on the coins is *Bhagavata svāmino Brhmaṇya(sa* or *sya) Yaudheya : BMC(AI)*, pp. cxlix and 270, Pl. XXXIX. 21.

46 The legend is *Bhagavata Chatreśvara-mahātmanaḥ* (*ibid.*, pp. ciii and 167, Pl. XXIII.12).

47 The legend is *Bhagavata Mahadevasa Rajaraña* or *Rājarāja* (*ibid.*, pp. lxxxv and 123, Pl. XIV.16). For the attribution of these coins, see B. Lahiri, *JNSI*, Vol. XXX, pp. 63-65, and A. Mitra Shastri, *ibid.*, Vol. XXVI. pp. 158-59.

IV

THE SUPPOSED JOINT- AND SUB-KINGS AMONGST EARLY INDO-GREEK RULERS

A. N. Lahiri, Calcutta University

The practice of appointing a blood-relation and the heir-apparent as joint-king was common amongst the Seleucid monarchs of Syria. This fact is known from written records and corroborated by numismatic evidence. Thus, we know that Seleucus I associated himself with his son Antiochus I by making him joint-king, and that Antiochus I also in his turn appointed his son Antiochus II a joint-king ;[1] and we have joint-coins which simultaneously bear names of both the reigning Seleucid emperor and his joint-king.[2]

Similarly, there were joint-kings amongst the Scythian and Parthian rulers of India, as known from their coins. Vonones ruled conjointly first with Spalahores, 'the brother of the king', and then with Spalagadames, 'son of Spalahores'.[3] We have then joint-coins of Orthagnes and Gondophares on the one hand and of Gondophares and Abdagases on the other.[4]

W. W. Tarn believes that there were not only 'joint-kings' but also 'sub-kings' amongst the Greek rulers of Bactria and India. Curiously enough, the very idea and his precise functions are otherwise unknown, and it is Tarn himself who not only coined the term 'sub-king', but also has conjectured his existence and defined his functions. He would be a younger son of the reigning sovereign and 'rule a definite part of the realm' ('not as joint-king or as satrap, but as sub-king'), with

1 Charles Seltman, *Greek Coins*, 1955, p. 229.

2 *Cambridge History of India*, Vol. I, 1922, Pl. II.2 (joint-coin of Seleucus I and Antiochus I).

3 R. B. Whitehead, *Catalogue of Coins in the Punjab Museum, Lahore*, Vol. I, 1914, p. 141, Pl. XIV.374 (Vonones and Spalahores) and p. 147, Pl. XIV.382 (Vonones and Spalagadames).

4 *Ibid.*, p. 155, note 1, Pl. XVI. 72 (Orthagnes and Gondophares) and p. 147, Pl. XV.9 (Gondophares and Sasan).

the right of coining. In fact, Tarn has recognised amongst the Indo-Greek rulers 'many such sub-kings', who, he believes, 'explain that standing numismatic puzzle, the large number of kings in the early period'. Tarn believes that Euthydemus I introduced this new state-form of getting a part of the realm ruled by a sub-king.[5]

What was the difference between a joint-king and a sub-king? As Tarn has shown, joint-kings were always sons and brothers of the reigning Seleucid who, though they in fact governed the eastern provinces from Seleucia, were in theory joint-rulers of the whole empire, and Babylon always dated by both names, those of the reigning Seleucid and the joint-king.[6] In fact, as we have already seen, the coins that bore their names also bore the names of the reigning sovereign, and were actually joint-issues. But the sub-king, as Tarn states, was a younger son of an important king, who was entrusted with the rule of a definite part of the realm. The sub-king was in fact an independent ruler, as coins issued in his own name indicate.[7]

However, let us discuss the question of 'early' Indo-Greek joint-kings, who, according to Tarn, were Euthydemus II and Demetrius II, the sons of Demetrius I.

Tarn believes that, while setting out for his long-term invasion of India, Demetrius I arranged that his eldest son Euthydemus II should govern Bactria during his absence , but he did not then follow the common Hellenistic practice of leaving the son merely as 'governor' there. He did not even make him his sub-king. Euthydemus II was alternately made a joint-king of Bactria and Sogdiana. This was, of course, a strange act ; but Tarn explains the anomaly by citing the parallel case when Ptolemy IV Philometor, while invading Syria. left his son Ptolemy Neos Philopator as king (i.e. joint-

5 *The Greeks in Bactria and India (GBI)*, 1951, p. 90.

6 *Loc. cit.*

7 This fact creates the greatest problem for the 'sub-king' theory, with special regard to Indo-Greek history ; for, coins, which are our only source of information, do not in any way indicate who amongst their issuers were 'regular' kings and who were 'sub-kings'.

king) in Egypt.[8] But curiously enough, all known coins of Euthydemus bear his name alone; and not a single one of them displays the joint-names of himself and his father or in any way indicates that he ever had the status of a joint-king.

Then, Tarn's arguments as to Demetrius II being a joint-king is also curious. According to him, 'it is the Seleucid bead and reel moulding on one of his tetradrachms in the British Museum which shows that he was king when Eucratides came'. And if Demetrius II was a king, he could only be a joint-king with his father in Bactria after the death of Euthydemus II, for while he was in the Paropamisadae as a sub-king, he 'had simply coined for his father'. However, though Tarn does not regard Justin's statement that Eucratides was killed by his own son, he believes Justin when the latter says that the son who killed Eucratides was joint-king with his father.[9] This fact shows that he was a 'king' and, as such, should have left his mark on the coinage. Tarn feels that Demetrius II, whose coins we have, was that joint-king son of Demetrius I and the killer of Ecratides.[10] But, as we see, in the case of Demetrius II too his coins do not indicate in any conceivable way that he was ever a joint-king.

We confess, we are not in the least convinced by Tarn's hypothesis and his characteristic arguments which are thoroughly based on surmise. In the absence of any other positive evidence, one has to furnish join-coins to prove that Euthydemus II and Demetrius II were ever joint-kings with their father Demetrius I. For, it may specially be noted that other known joint-rulers amongst the Indo-Greeks indeed had their joint-issues, and the Indo-Greek coinage does include the joint-coins of at least four pairs of kings and their respective joint-rulers. We have joint-coins of (1) Lysias and Antialcidas,[11]

8 *GBI*, p. 134. [Philometor was Ptolemy VI.—Ed].

9 *Ibid.*, pp. 157 and 201.

10 *Ibid.*, pp. 221-22.

11 A. N. Lahiri, *Corpus of Indo-Greek Coins*, p. 148, Pl. XXIII.13. We are not sure if this coin was actually a joint issue. It is possible that the coin is just a mule—struck with the obverse die of Lysias' normal coin

(2) Strato I and Agathocleia,[12] (3) Strato II and Strato III,[13] and (4) Hermaeus and Calliope.[14] It is therefore not easy to suppose that Euthydemus II and Demetrius II, had they really been joint-kings, would not leave any clear indication to that effect in their respective numismatic issues.

So far as the so-called sub-kings are concerned, Tarn asserts that Euthydemus I introduced the system of sub-king, and his son Antimachus I was the first known sub-king under him. From the evidence of find-spots of Antimachus' coins, as recorded by A. Cunningham, Tarn seems to place Antimachus in what appears to have been generally known as Margiane which, according to him, comprised Margiane proper, the country between the Margus and the lower Arius, and the satrapies of Astauene and Apavarktikene.[15] Antimachus I was first a sub-king under his father Euthydemus I and then at a subsequent period also was a sub-king under his brother Demetrius I.[16] But unfortunately all that Tarn says about Antimachus' status of sub-king and his sub-kingdom is based on surmise, and there is no clear and authentic evidence to prove his hypothesis. It is, however, interesting that, Tarn, conscious as he was about the curiousness of his views, tries to convince us by saying that his idea of sub-king has been accepted by Rostovtzeff and Altheim as a matter of course.[17]

As Tarn asserts, two other great kings, viz. Demetrius I and Menander (I), had a number of sub-kings under them. Antimachus I was Demetrius's sub-king in the northern regions of the

---

of the type of 'Bust of Heracles and Elephant' (cf. *ibid.*, Pl. XXIII.12) and the reverse die of Antialcidas' normal coin of the type of 'Bust of Zeus and Palms-and-piloi' (cf. *ibid.*, Pl. V.16).

12 *Ibid.*, p. 74, Pl. I.7-8.

13 *Ibid.*, p. 184, Pl. XXXII.11-12.

14 *Ibid.*, pp. 142-143, Pl. XXII.1-2.

15 *GBI*, pp. 87-88.

16 *Ibid.*, p. 90.

17 *Ibid.*, p. 523 (Addenda to p. 90) : "Both Rostovtzeff, *SEH*, p. 550, and Altheim, I, pp. 318 *sq.*, have accepted the idea of sub-king as a matter of course."

western provinces of Iran.[18] Of his four sons, Euthydemus II, and Demetrius II, as has already been noted, were joint-kings, while the two others, viz. Pantaleon and Agathocles, were sub-kings.[19] Not only this. Demetrius II who earlier served as a joint-king, subsequently also became a sub-king.[20] Then, besides Antimachus I and his three sons—Demetrius II, Pantaleon and Agathocles, Demetrius I had under him a fifth sub-king, viz. Apollodotus I whom Tarn places earlier than Pantaleon and Agathocles.[21]

Tarn speaks of two important sub-kingdoms which were but outlying provinces of the Bactrian kingdom of Demetrius I. One of them was the Seistan-Arachosia region, and the other was the Paropamisadae with the double city of Alexandria-Kapiśā as its capital.[22]

According to Tarn, Apollodotus I was initially Demetrius' sub-king in the Seistan-Arachosia region. Subsequently, when Apollodotus was taken by Demetrius to India, Pantaleon followed him there as a sub-king ; but, curiously enough, Tarn believes that there he struck coins not in his own name, but in that of his elder brother Euthydemus II who was Demetrius I's joint-king.[23] Pantaleon, however, was ultimately shifted to the Paropamisadae in place of Demetrius II who in his turn was made the joint-king in Bactria, apparently after the death of Euthydemus II.[24] Pantaleon, the rarity of whose coins indicate a very short reign, was soon followed by Agathocles as the sub-king of the Paropamisadae.[25]

All these appear to be a highly imaginary and confusing picture, where supposed joint-kings are replaced by hypothetical sub-kings, and one sub-king is followed by another sub-

18 *Ibid.*, p. 95.
19 *Loc. cit.*
20 *Ibid.*, pp. 157 and 201 (joint-king) and p. 137 (sub-king).
21 *Ibid.*, p. 95.
22 *Ibid.*, p. 95 (Seistan-Arachosia) and p. 97 (Paropamisadae).
23 *Ibid.*, p. 156.
24 *Ibid.*, pp. 156-57.
25 *Ibid.*, p. 157.

king ; and, strangely enough, coins do not reflect the position in any clear manner. It is difficult for a critical numismatist to subscribe to Tarn's views, specially when he places Apollodotus I earlier than Pantaleon and Agathocles. The nature and particularly the legends of the bilingual coins of Pantaleon and Agathocles indicate that they were possibly the two earliest Greek princes to strike coins in India and for the Indians (even though Tarn would like us to believe that their coins were issued not in India but from abroad for trade purposes).[26] Like Eucratides I, they rendered the Greek title *Basileus* by the term *Rājan*, 'king'. But Apollodotus' case is different. He, like all other Greek kings, used the term *Mahārāja*, 'great king', to translate *Basileus*. This fact, if nothing else, indicates that Apollodotus was later than Pantaleon and Agathocles.[27] In short, we do not think that any of these Greek princes, viz. Antimachus I, Apollodotus I, Demetrius II, Pantaleon and Agathocles, ever had the lesser status of sub-king. Undoubtedly they were all independent and full-fledged kings.

Then, no less a king than Eucratides I was also a sub-king, according to Tarn, and that too not of a king of Bactria, but of the Seleucid monarch Antiochus IV of Syria. This interesting conclusion is the result of Tarn's characteristic way of thinking. Eucratides was a half-Seleucid, since he used on his coins 'the reel and bead moulding' as introduced by Antiochus II, since the helmet that he wears on his coins is adorned by 'bull's ear and horn' which was the badge of Seleucus himself, and since his mother Laodice was a princess of the Seleucid royal house. In fact, Tarn believes that Laodice was the daughter of Seleucus II and sister of Antiochus III, and consequently Eucratides was the first cousin of Antiochus IV.

26 *Ibid.*, pp. 160-61 and 162. Tarn says this with special reference to the bilingual copper pieces of Agathocles.

27 A. N. Lahiri, 'Who struck the first Indo-Greek Bilingual Coins ?' in *Proc. IHC*, 1964, pp. 142ff. Cf. John Marshall, *Taxila*, Vol. I, p. 30, where he places Pantaleon and Agathocles earlier than Apollodotus I, at least in Taxila.

Eucratides was, like his father under Antiochus III, the governor of the upper satrapies under Antiochus IV.[28]

Sometime before 166 B.C., Eucratides marched towards the east, i.e. Bactria, as Antiochus' representative. "Antiochus then had conferred upon him, before he started, the royal title in the province he should conquer." But since he was not a blood-relation of Antiochus, he was not a joint-king. "Eucratides was then Antiochus' sub-king."[29] Indeed Eucratides remained a sub-king till the death of Antiochus even after the conquest of Bactria and the assumption of the title *Megas* (Great) and the striking of the 20-stater piece, the world's biggest gold coin of antiquity.[30] Contrary to common belief, Tarn thinks that Eucratides was not a rebel ; but that he raised and led a rebellion against Demetrius and his party.[31]

But, as we feel, all that Tarn says about Eucratides' relation with Antiochus IV and his status as sub-king (till the death of that Seleucid monarch) is a sheer hypothesis based on curious surmises. For, it is hard to believe that the first cousin and sub-king of no less a person than Antiochus IV, should be allowed to be reduced to the hopeless position of rebel who did not have more than 300 men to follow him when Demetrius I attacked him with 60,000 soldiers.[32] Nay, Eucratides could only be an adventurer, and a mighty adventurer at that. He was probably a 'governor'[33] of some province under Demetrius I, but rose against his master while the latter was away in India and ultimately succeeded in his rebellion. It is apparent that what Eucratides achieved was due to his own effort and he became the 'great king' of Bactria by his own

28 *GBI, loc. cit.*

29 *Ibid.*, pp. 203-04.

30 *Ibid.*, pp. 207-08.

31 *Ibid.*,...

32 We discussed this question in *Ind. Hist. Quart.*,Vol. XXXIII,pp. 40ff.

33 Cf. *The Classical Accounts*, ed. R. C. Majumdar, pp. 416-17 : "There is a city which a man of royal extraction called Soras governed at the time when Eucratides governed the Bactrians...." This passage from Aelian, XV.8, probably suggests the status of Eucratides as a governor.

might and valour. It was after his great victory over the Euthydemids and consolidation of power in Bactria that Eucratides made his incursions in the Indian soil and conquered some territories in India, where he introduced the bilingual currency with the Prakrit version of the coin-legend written in Kharoṣṭhi characters.[34]

Finally, amongst the Greek kings of India, Menander alone is credited to have 'some sub-kings' under him. Tarn readily recognises Antiochus II as one of them, and refers to Zoilus I as a possible second.[35]

The reasons for Tarn's belief that Antimachus II was Menander's sub-king in Gandhāra may be summed up in the following way. Gandhāra which was evidently part of Menander's realm is not represented by Menander's coins, since 'Śiva's bull' (which was, according to Tarn, the characteristic device of the Gandhāra coinage) does not occur on them. So 'probably he ruled Gandhāra through a sub-king'. Now, as the Bajaur hoard included 'a mass of almost new coins' of Antimachus II in conjunction with almost new coins of Apollodotus and Menander, it is evident that Antimachus was an early king contemporary with Menander and that his kingdom must have been in Gandhāra. Antimachus II, who was, according to Tarn, the son of Antimachus I Theos and who escaped to India from Eucratides' attack, fought for Apollodotus or Menander or for both against Eucratides, and was, after Eucratides' departure, made a sub-king of Gandhāra by Menander. Antimachus' natural hatred for Eucratides proved him to be 'the right man to guard the frontier province'. "What clinches the matter", Tarn argues, "is that all Antiochus' four monograms are said to occur frequently on Menander's coins : he was therefore Menander's sub-king, and his money, as was not unusual with sub-kings, was struck for him in his suzerain's mint."[36]

34 A. N. Lahiri, in *Proc. IHC*, 1964, pp. 124ff.

35 *GBI*, pp. 229-30 (Antimachus II), and *ibid.*, p. 229, note 3 ("Zoilus Dikaios may have been another...") and also p. 319.

36 *Ibid.*, pp. 229-30.

It is not unlikely that Antimachus II was a contemporary of Menander I and even there might have been some relationship between the two. But if he was not a son of Menander (since Tarn makes him a son of Antimachus I), he was not entitled to be a sub-king of Menander, for it was only 'a younger son' who, as Tarn asserts, could be a sub-king with his father. Was his supposed intense hatred for Eucratides sufficient to remove his disqualification? Then, it is not certain that Śiva's bull alone was always the characteristic device of Gandhāra coinage. Menander's abundant silver issues with the type of Athena and some of his copper coins with other devices might have constituted his Gandhāra coinage. Finally, occurrence of some given monograms on two contemporary kings' coins may not imply that one of them was a sub-king of the other. In that event, one may hold that Menander was a sub-king of Eucratides I or *vice versa*, since their coins have at least 'eleven' monograms in common. Under the circumstances, we do not think that Antimachus II and Zoilus I were sub-kings of Menander I Soter.[37]

The theory that there were joint-kings and sub-kings amongst the early Indo-Greek rulers is indeed an attractive one, and not only Rostovtzeff and Altheim, but also Marshall and Narain, have somehow accepted it. Thus, John Marshall, while refuting some of Tarn's views entertains the posibility that Demetrius II was a sub-king in Arachosia and then a joint-king in Bactria under his father.[38] According to Marshall, Pantaleon, Agathocles and Apollodotus I were also sub-kings of Demetrius I.[39] A.K. Narain, likewise, thinks that Menander had at least four sub-kings, viz. Polyxenus and Epander besides Antimachus II and Zoilus I.[40]

We need not, however, invent new state-forms and surmise the existence of unrecorded joint-kings and hypothetical sub-

37 A. N. Lahiri, *CIGC*, p. 243, where monograms common to Eucratides I and Menander (I) are given in brackets.

38 *GBI, loc. cit.*

39 Cf. *Taxila*, Vol. I, p. 34.

40 *The Indo-Greeks*, pp. 95-96 and 115.

kings in order to accommodate a large number of kings in a short span of time and in comparatively limited regions. Scarcity of their coins, and their localised and rare find-spots indicate that many of these Greek princes were but petty chiefs of small kingdoms with more or less short reign. But we need not assume that they were necessarily always hostile to one another.

In fact, the very urge for survival in a foreign land and other common interests made it imparative that the Greek rulers should live peacefully and follow a code of conduct based on mutual goodwill and co-operation.* Geographical conditions were eminently conducive to such a state of affairs. The hilly surroundings of Northern Afghanistan and North-Western India, which these Greek princes successively dominated, found, to their convenience, many contiguous regions of various sizes, more or less naturally isolated from one another. And the Greeks, who were once in their homeland accustomed to live somewhat independently in naturally isolated and separate city-states, welcomed the conditions. It is, therefore, not difficult to imagine a few Greek princes ruling simultaneously in comparatively small and geographically isolated independent principalities. If so, it is quite possible and likely that many contemporary Greek princes with their sway over contiguous regions, who lacked necessary facilities and resources, got their coins manufactured in common mints or through common minting agencies, which had one or more mints and a number of mint-masters and artist-engravers. This may explain the occurrence of common monograms on coins of two or more rulers, assuming that the monograms variously represented kings, minting agencies, mint-masters and artist-engravers.

Of course, while visualising the above likely state of affairs, we do not assert that the rulers were never unfriendly to one

*[Note, however, that one of the characteristics of Yavana rule in India is indicated in the Purāṇas at *hatvā c=aiva parasparam*, i.e. the slaughter of one another. Cf. Pargiter, *The Purāṇa Text*, p. 56 and note 4.—Ed.]

another. In fact, jealousy, greed and power often played their respective roles. One prince would sometimes envy the prosperity of another prince and pounce upon his kingdom. A victorious army chief would occasionally be too greedy and usurp his master's throne. And a powerful king would like to encroach upon others' dominions and start wars.

In fact, the Demetriuses and the Menanders would often like to enlarge the limits of their dominions. Consequently, there would be sporadic aggressions, consequent conquests of smaller kingdoms by comparatively resourceful and mighty monarchs. Such powerful kings would, however, consolidate their position and establish one or more well-equiped mints of their own, where their coins would be manufactured by various mint-masters and through a number of artists. Naturally, specimens of their conceivably abundant coinage will display many monograms. Mints of such a powerful king might also produce coins for his less resourceful neighbours, displaying monograms that variously represented them, and their masters and artist-engravers. This may easily explain the occurrence of common monograms on the coins of a great king like Menander I on the one hand and his minor contemporaries like Antimachus II, Zoilus I, Epander and Polyxenus on the other.

V

AN ASPECT OF THE GOVERNMENT POLICY IN ANCIENT INDIA

Bhaskar Chatterjee, Burdwan University

Among the seven elements *(prakṛti)* of State, namely, Svāmin, Amātya, Janapada, Durga, Kośa, Bala and Mitra, the Kośa or treasury is given highest importance in the *Arthaśāstra* (II.2) where it is said that all undertakings of the government depend upon its financial position. In the Śānti-parvan (119.16) of the *Mahābhārata*, the *Kāmandakīya-Nītisāra* (XIII.33) and the *Viṣṇudharmottara Purāṇa* (II.61-17), treasury (Kośa) or finance has been eulogised as the basis or support of the State. The principal means of filling the treasury is taxation and the main source of State revenue is agricultural production. It is obvious that the State should undertake a programme of agricultural development with the objective of exploiting the economic resources of the Janapada or rural areas to their utmost.

In this connection, the geo-political ideas of Kauṭilya are relevant. The *Arthaśāstra* (VI.1) gives us a comprehensive list[1] of the marks of a good rural area, amongst which mention may be made of deforestation, agricultural lands yielding sufficient products, provision of water supply without dependence on rains, enough subsistence of the people mainly of the low castes, and finally, capability of enduring the burden of the king's taxes. The ideal Janapada as visualised by Kauṭilya can be brought into reality by State planning. In the *Arthaśāstra* (II.1) is found a scheme of state-planned colonization of the rural area, according to which the initiative is to be taken by the government for settling between one hundred and five hundred families of industrious and efficient cultivators, mostly Śūdra by caste, in a single village, and irrigation work is to be

1 U. N. Ghoshal, *A History of Indian Political Ideas*, p. 125.

undertaken by the government or with governmental help for agricultural development of each village.[2] Kauṭilya (II.24) refers to the various ways in which crops could be raised with water and the revenue to be demanded in each case. Those who watered crops with manual labour had to pay one-fifth of the produce ; those who carried water on their shoulders paid one-third ; and those who raised water from rivers, lakes, tanks and wells paid one-fourth. It is implied that the rise and fall in production largely depended upon the nature of irrigation works organised in connection with agriculture.

That the *Arthaśāstra* of Kauṭilya was looked upon as a manual for the administrators is borne out by the account of Megasthenes[3] who informs us that the greater part of the soil of India in his day was under irrigation and consequently bore two crops in the area.* It is further known from the Greek writer[4] that some were in charge of superintending the rivers, measurement of land and inspection of the sluices by which water was let out from the main canals into their branches so that everyone might have an equal share in it. In the Sabhā-parvan (5.77) of the *Mahābhārata*, the king is advised to have large tanks in different parts of the country full of water and to see that agriculture did not depend on the rains alone. The *Śukranītisāra* (IV.4.60)** remarks that the king should arrange for plenty of water in his kingdom by digging wells with steps, tanks, lakes, etc. The political thinkers of ancient times considered the hydraulic works as one of the essential functions of the State in view of climate and territorial condition which made artificial irrigation by canals and waterworks the basis of agriculture.[5] The water control necessitated in India, where the territorial extent was vast, to call into life voluntary

2 *Ibid.*, pp. 135-36.

3 McCrindle, *Ancient India*, p. 30.

*[For 'area', 'year' seems to be intended.—Ed.]

4 *Ibid.*, p. 86.

**[It is regarded as a modern work by some.—Ed.]

5 Marx, *New York Daily Tribune*, June 25 and August 8, 1853.

association, the interference of the centralizing power of the government.*

A canal opened by a Nanda king in his one hundred and third year* was later on extended by Khāravela, king of Kaliṅga, in the fifth year of his reign.[7] The Maurya kings Candragupta and Aśoka caused the great Surdarśana lake near Girinagara to be made by their respective provincial governors, Vaiśya Puṣyagupta and Yavanarāja Tuṣāspha.[8] In such public works of utility, the Indian kings might have secured the services of some engineers like Isidatta and Purāṇa who are mentioned as *sthapatis* in the *Dhammacetiya Sutta* of the *Majjhimanikāya* (II).[9] In Aśoka's language, these works are to be understood as *dhaṁmathaṁbhāni* (Pillar Edict VII) or monumental acts of piety** which included probably the construction of roads, the planting of shade trees, the sinking of wells, the excavation of tanks, the laying out of fruit-gardens, the erection of alms-houses, the construction of religious mounds, the making of cave-dwellings, etc. Wittfogel remarks : "The masters of the hydraulic state did not confine their activities to matters immediately connected with agriculture. The methods of co-operation which were so effective in the sphere of crop-raising were easily applied to a variety of other large tasks."[10] By 'hydraulic state', the writer means the government undertaking waterworks, the basis or main support of agriculture. The society depending upon such means of production is designated by him as 'hydraulic society'.

However, after the downfall of the Maurya empire, foreign invaders conquered and successively ruled Northern India. The plough-using village dominated the economy of the part

6 *Loc. cit.*; cf. Karl A. Wittfogel, *Oriental Despotism*, p. 374.

*[This is absolutely wrong and absurd.—Ed.]

7 Hathigumpha inscription (Sircar, *Select Inscriptions*, p. 208).

8 Junagadh inscription of Rudradâman (*ibid.*, p. 171).

9 Barua, *Aśoka*, p. 186.

**[This figurative meaning is not quite suitable to the Aśokan context. —Ed.]

10 Wittfogel, *op., cit.* p. 30.

of India conqured by the foreigners who mainly looted the surplus gathered under the preceding rulers.[11] The Kuṣāṇas might have devised a successful method of continued surplus extraction and thus retained their empire for about two centuries.[12] But Rudradāman, the Mahākṣatrapa of Ujjain, who had assimilated Indian political theories,[13] proved his success as an administrator by causing the repair of the Sudarśana lake under the supervision of his governor, the Parthian Suviśākha, the son of Kulaipa.[14] State policy formulated in the Maurya period was consistently followed through the ages. Mayūraśarman,[15] the Kadamba king ruling in the fourth century A. D., is said to have brought into being a tank, evidently for irrigation purposes. Skandagupta, the Gupta emperor, caused the last known repair of the Sudarśana lake in 456 A. D. to be made by his governor Cakrapālita, son of Parṇadatta.[16] It is known from Kalhaṇa's *Rājataraṅgiṇī* (V.84-117) that the great engineer Suyya under Avantivarman (833-58 A.D.),* king of Kashmir, successfully dammed the river Vitastā with the result that a *khārī* of rice which could formerly be purchased for 200 *dināras* could be had, after the irrigation work, for 36 *dināras*. Bhoja (died in 1055-56 A. D.), the Paramāra king, is said to have built up a huge reservoir of water at the city of Bhojapura.[17]

The epigraphic records lead us to believe that the government in ancient India was closely concerned with the programme of agricultural development, for the requirements of the State had to be met with the surplus production in the form of revenue derived from land. The ruling class, the bureaucracy, had to maintain itself by the wealth produced by others. But

11 D. D. Kosambi, *Introduction to Indian History*, p. 227.

12 *Ibid.*, p. 233. [There is no basis for such conjectures.—Ed.]

13 Altekar, *State and Government in Ancient Idia*, p. 334.

14 Junagadh inscription of Rudradāman (Sircar, *op. cit.*, pp. 170-74.)

15 Chandravalli stone inscription (*ibid.*, p. 449.)

16 Junagadh inscription of Skandagupta (*ibid.*, p. 449).

*[Avantivarman actually ruled in c. 856-83 A.D.—Ed.]

17 *Ind. Ant.*, Vol. XVII, 1888, pp. 348-52 ; Kosambi, *op. cit.*, p. 281.

we do not agree with Kosambi[18] when he says that the function of the State was to coerce the producers to support the ruling class, for the Śūdra did all the manual work and the Vaiśya lived on trade. Manu (VIII.418) says, "The king should carefully compel the Vaiśyas and Śūdras to perform the work prescribed for them, for if these two castes swerved from their duties, they would throw the whole world into confusion." This statement does not imply that force lay at the foundation of the State and social order. On the other hand, the evidences discussed above indicate the propensity in the government policy towards supplying aids to increase capability of the people in bearing the burden of taxation. However, the state interference in economic production and other associated public works brought about absolute State control in every sphere of life and thus led towards the growth of an exalted type of monarchy, despotism, though of a benevolent character.

Kāmandaka (IV.51-52) states that the land, adorned with crops, rich in mines, minerals, etc., copiously watered and not depending upon showers of rain for agricultural purposes, is specially favourable for the welfare and prosperity of the people. The State organisation of irrigation works was essential not only to bring about prosperity of the people, but also to save them from calatimies like famine. In the *Bṛhatsaṁhitā* of Varāhamihira,[19] we find the prediction of excessive rainfall and inundation causing crop failure and famine. Varāhamihira often refers[20] to drought which was another cause of famine. No crops could be grown without water. As measures to avert the calamity caused by famine, the king is advised by Kauṭilya (IV.3) to provide the people with seed and food, start works for those who are distressed, distribute either his own collection of provisions or that of the rich, or call for help from his allies, tax the rich and make them disgorge their wealth, or migrate to other countries that have abundant

18 Kosambi, *op. cit.*, p. 238.

19 S. K. Maity, *The Economic Life of Northern India*, p. 193.

20 *Loc. cit.*

harvests. The Mahasthan inscription[21] shows that *gaṇḍaka* coins were distributed and corn was also supplied to famine-stricken people *(ātyayikāya)*. The Sohgaura copper-plate inscription[22] contains an order of the Mahāmātras of Śrāvasti that two state-granaries are to be spent only in case of emergency *(ātyayika)*, that is, famine. The evidences taken together indicate that, in financial distress, the people at large had to be dependent on the State for subsidy either in kind or in cash. The State in its turn might have taken financial help from the richer people of the community, presumably the Śreṣṭhins.

From the economic point of view, the functions of the king or the head of the community were extensive. The king was not to confine himself to mere police duties or administration of justice. It was the duty of the king to find out means of subsistence for the people. Failing that, the king was to maintain those without means and to relieve distress. Gautama (X. 28-29), Manu (VII. 128 ; VIII. 306-08) and other law-givers state that taxation is meant for the protection of the subjects and that it is the king's wages for the protection he affords. Again, Manu (IX. 305) compares the king taking taxes to the sun that produces vapour from the seas in order to return it in the form of rains. There is no guarantee that the kings always liked to abide by the laws. But, as we have shown above, the State had to play a significant role in the economic life of the people, if not for the sake of the producers of wealth, at least for the ruling class who enjoyed the wealth produced by others. The State had to see that the self-supporting village-economy depending upon a combination of small agriculture and domestic industry might be permitted its age-long perpetuation.

21 Sircar, *op. cit.*, pp. 82-83.

22 *Ibid.*, pp. 85-86.

VI

SOME PRINCIPLES OF RĀJA-DHARMA

D. C. Sircar, Calcutta University

It is well known that in Chapter 100 of the Ayodhyā-kāṇḍa of the *Rāmāyaṇa*, there are many questions which Rāma put to Bharata when the latter met the former in the forest. The said questions are all related to the welfare of the king and his State. It is also well known that similar questions were put to Yudhiṣṭhira by Nārada in the *Mahābhārata*, Sabhā-parvan, Chapter 5. There are similar sections elsewhere also. Cf. *ibid.*, XV.5.

Students of the epics must have noticed that a number of stanzas in the said chapters of the two epics are common and that some of them have not even variant readings at least in the copies of epics consulted by us. The stanzas appear to have been borrowed by the epics from the popular floating literature. While the verses comprising the questions are 65 in the *Rāmāyaṇa*, their number is 107 in the *Mahābhārata*, the common stanzas being as many as 33. All these stanzas refer to popular principles of *Rāja-dharma* which is part of the science called variously as *Rāja-śāstra*, *Rāja-nīti*, *Rāja-vṛtta*, *Rāja-tantra*, *Nīti-śāstra*, *Daṇḍa-nīti*, *Nīti*, etc. The 33 common verses may be regarded as some of the most popular among the principles of *Rāja-dharma*. Another interesting fact is that, in a few cases, the idea noticed in one stanza is found repeated in another verse, and the principle involved in such repetitions may be regarded as specially important ; e.g., verses 1-2 ; see also verses 4 and 6, 15-16, 21-22, and also verse 31 compared to verses 4, 6 and 7. The said 33 stanzas are quoted and commented on in the following lines.

1. *Kaccid=arthena vā dharmaṁ dharmeṇa=ārtham=ath=āpi vā/*
   ubhau vā prīti-sāreṇa na kāmena pravādhase//
   M. 9 ; R. 62 : v. 1. *prīti-lobhena kāmena na vivādhase.*

The stanza prescribes the king's enjoyment of the *tri-varga* in a balanced way. He should not put *artha*, in the way of

dharma, nor *dharma* in the way of *artha*. Likewise, he should not put *kāma* in the way of either *dharma* or *artha* or the latter in the way of the former. The same idea, also noticed in other works, is continued in the following stanza.

2. *Kaccid=artham ca dharmam ca kāmam ca jayatām vara/*
vibhajya kāle kāla-jña sadā varada sevase//
M. 10 ; R. 63 : v. 1. *sarvān* for *sadā*.

This verse also refers to the balanced enjoyment of *artha*, *dharma* and *kāma*, each of the three of which should be enjoyed in proper measure and in proper time.

The emphasis put on the same principle by its repetition is intelligible. The history of India and the world offers illustrations of kings or their States being led to ruin by an excessive attachment to any one of the above three. We know, e.g., how king Jayāpīḍa (8th–9th century A.D.) of Kashmir lost his life, how the great emperor Aśoka (c. 272–232 B.C.) caused the decline and downfall of the Maurya empire and how the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king Govinda II (c. 775–80 A.D.) lost his throne as a result of excessive enjoyment of *artha*, *dharma* and *kāma* respectively. See Stein, *Kalhaṇa's Rājataraṅgiṇī*, Vol. I, p. 95 ; Sircar, *Inscriptions of Aśoka*, 1967, pp. 28-29 ; Altekar, *The Rāṣṭrakūṭas and their Times*, 1934, p. 50.

3. *Kaccid=ātma-samā buddhyā śucayo jīvita-kṣamāḥ/*
kulīnāś=c=ānuraktāś=ca kṛtās=te vīra mantriṇaḥ//
M. 16 ; R. 15 : v. 1. *vṛddhāḥ śuddhāḥ saṁbodhana-kṣamāḥ, śūrāḥ śrutavantaḥ jit-endriyāḥ* ; *iṅgitajñāḥ* for *anuraktāḥ*.

Here we have the qualifications of the mantrins to be appointed by the king. They should be as intelligent as the king himself (*ātma-samā buddhyā*) and should also be honest (*śuci, śuddha*), capable of earning their livelihood *(jīvita-kṣama)*, born in noble families (*kulīna*) and attached to their master (*anurakta*). The variant readings suggest that they should be valiant warriors (*śūra*), learned or proficient in the sacred knowledge (*śrutavantaḥ*), having control over their sense or passions *(jitendriya)* and skilled in interpreting signs (*iṅgitajña*). Such qualifications are often noticed in literary and epigraphic

records and reference may be made to the description of Suviśākha and Parṇadatta in the Junagadh inscriptions of Rudradāman and Skandagupta respectively (Sircar, *Select Inscriptions*, Vol. I, 1965, pp, 180, 309-10).

4. *Vijayo mantra-mūlo hi rājñāṁ bhavati Bhārata/*
susaṁvṛto mantra-dhanair=amātyaiḥ śāstra-kovidaiḥ//
M. 17 ; R. 16 : v. l. *kaccit saṁvṛta-mantrais=te, susaṁvṛta-mantri-dhuraiḥ* ; *Rāghava* for *Bhārata.*

This verse speaks of the importance of the *amātyas*, apparently the same as *mantrins* referred to in the previous stanza. If the secrecy of policies or secret plans of a king is maintained by his *amātyas* who are learned in the *śāstras*, it leads to victory. The secrecy of plans is also referred to below, No. 6.

5. *Kaccin=nidrā-vaśam n=aiṣi kaccit kāle vibudhyase/*
kaccic=c=āpara-rātreṣu cintayasy=artha-dharma-vit//
M. 18 ; R. 17 : v. 1. *artham=artha-vit, artha-naipuṇyam.*

According to this stanza, the king should have control over sleep and should get up from bed at the right time. He should formulate plans regarding *artha* and *dharma* about the end of the night, i.e. very early in the morning.

6. *Kaccin=mantrayase n=aikaḥ kaccin=na bahubhiḥ saha/*
kaccit=te mantrito mantro na rāṣṭram=anudhāvati//
M. 19 ; R. 18 : v. 1. *paridhāvati.*

In this verse, the king is advised not to formulate secret plans alone or discuss them with too many people, and it is suggested that such plans should not be divulged to the people (*rāṣṭra*). The secrecy of plans is also referred to above, No. 4.

7. *Kaccid=arthān viniścitya laghu-mūlān mah-odayān/*
kṣipram=ārabhase kartuṁ na vighnayasi tādṛśān//
M. 20 ; R. 19 : v. 1. *artham*, etc. ; *karma* for *kartuṁ* ; *Rāghava* for *tādṛśān.*

In this verse, the king is advised to concentrate on plans of work which are easy to perform, but bring in important results and to begin their execution as quickly as possible and not to delay them in any way.

8. *Kaccit sahasrair=mūrkhāṇām=ekaṁ krīṇāsi paṇḍitam/*
paṇḍito hy=artha-kṛcchreṣu kuryān=niḥśreyasaṁ param//
M. 24 ; R. 22 : v. 1. *icchasi* for *krīṇāsi* ; *mahat* for *param.*

The king is advised here to discard one thousand unlettered people (*mūrkha*) in favour of a single learned man (*paṇḍita*) because, in difficult matters or financial troubles (*artha-kṛcchreṣu*), a learned man alone is capable of helping him in finding a way out.

9. *Kaccid=durgāṇi sarvāṇi dhana-dhāny-āyudh-odakaiḥ/*
yantraiś=ca paripūrṇāni tathā śilpi-dhanurdharaiḥ//
M. 25 ; R. 53 : v. 1. *pratipūrṇāni.*

The verse says that the king should keep all his fortresses supplied with enough money (*dhana*), food or provisions (*dhānya*), missiles (*āyudha*), water (*udaka*), contrivances (*yantra*), artisans (*śilpin*) and archers (*dhanurdhara*). For the defence of cities, see the *Mahābhārata*, III. 15 or 16.

10. *Eko='py=amātyo medhāvī śūro dānto vicakṣaṇaḥ/*
rājānaṁ rājaputraṁ vā prāpayen=mahatīṁ śriyam//
M. 26 ; R. 24 : v. 1. *dakṣa* for *dānta.*

This stanza is associated with Nos. 3 and 8 and says that even a single *amātya*, who is valiant and has self-control (*dānta*; or *dakṣa*, skilful or upright) and wisdom (*vicakṣaṇa*), is capable of bringing in great prosperity for the king or prince whom he serves.

11. *Kaccid=aṣṭādaś=ānyeṣu sva-pakṣe daśa pañca ca/*
tribhis=tribhir=a-vijñātair=vetsi tīrthāni cārakaiḥ//
M. 27 ; R. 36 : v. 1. *cāraṇaiḥ.*

The king is advised here to employ three spies (*cāraka*, *cāraṇa*) each for getting information about the 18 *tīrthas* (the king's counsellors) on the enemy's side and 15 *tīrthas* on his own side. The spies should be unknown to each other and to the persons about whom they would gather information. The eighteen *tīrthas* in the enemy's territory are enumerated by the commentators as the following : (1) minister, (2) priest, (3) crown-prince, (4) leader of forces, (5) chief guard of the palace or city gate, (6) superintendent of the harem, (7) superinten-

dent of jails, (8) treasurer, (9) officer declaring royal orders in respect of work to be continued or undertaken, (10) judge (*pradeṣṭṛ*), (11) governor of a city or prefect of the city police, (12) administrator, (13) judicial officer in charge of gifts, (14) superintendent of the gambling halls (*sabh-ādhyakṣa*), (15) officer in charge of the punishment of criminals, (16) governor of the forts, (17) warden of the marches, and (18) officer in charge of forests. The fifteen *tīrthas* of the king's own realm are Nos. 4-18 of the above list.[1]

12. *Kaccid=dviṣām=a-viditaḥ pratiyattaś=ca sarvadā|*
nitya-yukto ripūn sarvān vīkṣase ripusūdana||

M. 28 : R. 37 : v. 1. *vyapāstān=ahitān pratiyātāṁś=ca ; durbalān=anavajñāya vartase ; pratipanna* for *pratiyatta.*

According to this verse, the king should be always on the alert and ready to fight with the enemy, though the latter would have to be kept in the dark about his own plans. The variant reading suggests that the king should not neglect the strength of the defeated enemy returning to attack even if the latter looks like weak.

13. *Kaccid=vinaya-sampannaḥ kulaputro bahu-śrutaḥ|*
anasūyur=anupraṣṭā satkṛtas=te purohitaḥ||

M. 29 ; R. 11 : v. 1. *anuddraṣṭā* for *anupraṣṭā.*

This verse refers to the qualifications of a good *purohita* whom the king should honour. The priest should be endowed

---

1 Nīlakaṇṭha's commentary quotes the following stanzas (cf. *Pañcatantra*, III. 66 ff.) :

Mantrī purohitaś=c=aiva yuvarājaś=camūpatiḥ|
pañcamo dvārapālaś=ca ṣaṣṭho='ntarveśikas=tathā||
Kārāgār-ādhikārī ca dravya-sañcaya-kṛt tathā|
kṛty-ākṛtyeṣu c=ārthānāṁ navamo viniyojakaḥ||
Pradeṣṭā nagar-ādhyakṣaḥ kārya-nirmāṇa-kṛt tathā|
dharm-ādhyakṣo sabh-ādhyakṣo daṇḍapālas=tri-pañcamaḥ||
Ṣoḍaśo durga-pālaś=ca tathā rāṣṭr-ānta-pālakaḥ|
aṭavī-pālakas=tāni tīrthāny=aṣṭādaś=aiva tu||
Cārān=vicārayet tīrtheṣv=ātmanaś=ca parasya ca|
pākhaṇḍ-ādīn=avijñātān=anyo='nyam=itareṣv=api||
mantriṇaṁ yuvarājaṁ=ca hitvā teṣu purohitam||

with *vinaya* (discipline, moral -training, or decency, modesty) born of respectable parentage, learned in the sacred lore, devoid of jealousy and eager to perform duty without question. The word *anuddraṣṭā*, which seems to be a better reading, means one who does not direct in a wrong way.

14. *Kaccid=agniṣu te yukto vidhijño matimān=ṛjuḥ/*
hutaṁ ca hoṣyamāṇañ=ca kāle vedayate sadā//
M. 30 ; R. 12.

Here we have a reference to the officer (i.e. a priest) placed in charge of the king's household fire. He should be an expert in rituals, intelligent and honest and should inform the king in proper time the rituals already performed and those which should have to be performed. The stanza refers to the importance the Indians attached to religious rites. See also No. 32 below.

15. *Kaccin=mukhyā mahatsv=eva madhyameṣu ca madhyamāḥ/*
jaghanyāś=ca jaghanyeṣu bhṛtyāḥ karmasu yojitāḥ//
M. 32 ; R. 25 : v. 1. *tāta* for *karmasu*.

This stanza advises the king to engage high-class officers in important work, middle-class officers in less important work and low-class officers in unimportant work. The same idea is continued in the following stanza.

16. *Amātyān upadh-ātītān pitṛ-paitāmahān śucīn/*
śreṣṭhāñ=śreṣṭheṣu kaccit=tvaṁ niyojayasi karmasu//
M. 33 (cf. XV. 5.14) ; R. 26.

The advice to the king implied in this verse is an elaboration of the statement in No. 15 above. It says that the king should engage the best of his officers, who are honest, hereditarily engaged in royal service and passed in the tests (*upadhā*). It is difficult to say whether the reference is to the passing in only one or in several tests. The four important tests are described in Kauṭilya's *Arthaśāstra* (I. 10) as *dharm-opadhā* or religiousness-test, *arth-opadhā* or greed-test, *kām-opadhā* or love-test and *bhay-opadhā* or fear-test.

17. *Kaccin=n=ogreṇa daṇḍena bhṛśam=udvejita-prajāḥ/*
rāṣṭraṁ tav=ānuśāsanti mantriṇo Bharatarṣabha//
M. 34 ; R. 27 ; v. 1. *rāṣṭre tav=ānujānanti* ; *udvijase* for *udvejita* ; *Kaikeyīsuta* for *Bharatarṣabha.*

Here the king is warned against his *mantrins* who oppress the subjects by their tyranny while governing the territory. The variant reading *udvejitāḥ prajāḥ rāṣṭre tav=ānujānanti* suggests that the *mantrins* should not allow the subjects to be oppressed by the officers.

18. *Kaccit=tvāṁ n=āvajānanti yājakāḥ patitaṁ yathā/*
ugra-pratigrahītāraṁ kāmayānam=iva striyaḥ//
M. 35 ; R. 28 : v. 1. *ugrā-pratigrahītāram.*

This verse warns the king of being despised by the priests (or better, by the people or officers) just as the outcast person is hated by the sacrificing priests and the violent and lustful husband by the wives. The variant *ugrā-pratigrahītaram*, which is a better reading, suggests that the husband of an *ugrā*, meaning a cruel woman of violent temper, is hated (i.e. avoided by other women.

19. *Kaccid=dhṛṣṭaś=ca śūraś=ca matimāṁ=śuciḥ/*
kulīnaś=c=ānuraktaś=ca dakṣaḥ senāpatis=tava//
M. 36 ; R. 30 : v. 1. *kṛtaḥ* or *tathā* for *tava.*

Here the qualifications of the commander of the forces suitable for being appointed by the king, are enumerated. He should be contented, valiant, intelligent, steadfast, honest, born in a good family, attached to his master, and skilful.

20. *Kaccid=balasya te mukhyāḥ sarve yuddha-viśāradāḥ/*
dṛṣṭ-āpadānā vikrāntās=tvayā satkṛtya mānitāḥ//
M. 37 ; R. 31 : v. 1. *balavantaś=ca kaccit=te, mukhāḥ sarva°*; *dhṛṣṭ-āvadātā* for *dṛṣṭ-āpadānā.*

The king is advised here to honour all the leaders of his forces, who are experts in fighting, have proved their worth by excellent work and are valiant. The same idea is noticed in the expression *kṛt-opadhānaṁ* (explained by Nīlakaṇṭha as *kṛta-viśeṣam*; v.l. *kṛt-āpadānaṁ*) *balam* in the *Mahābhārata*, III. 15 (or 16).21. The importance of the appreciation of merits of

generals for their successes in order to encourage them is recognised all over the world.[2]

21. *Kaccid=balasya bhaktañ=ca vetanaṁ ca yath-ocitam/*
samprāpta-kālaṁ dātavyaṁ dadāsi na vikarṣasi//

M. 38; R. 32 : v. l. *vilambase* for *vikarṣasi*; *kāle* for *kālam*.

This stanza advises the king to pay his soldiers their pay (*vetana*) and allowance (*bhakta*) at the proper time whenever they are due and not to delay in this matter. In the *Mahābhārata*, III. 15 (or 16).21, also we are told that the army (*bala*) should be—*datta-vetana-bhaktaṁ ca datt-āyudha-paricchadam/ kṛtopadhānañ=ca* (v.l. *kṛt-āpadānañ=ca*), etc. In the same context (verse 22), it is further said that, at the time of war, *na kupya-vetani kaścin=na c=ātikrānta-vetanī/ n=ānugrahabhṛtaḥ kaścit*, etc., which shows that each soldier received wages in precious metals, and there was none who did not receive any wages and was merely serving for the master's favour. The disastrous result of delayed payment of pay and allowance is indicated in the following verse. The fact that the king's soldiers received wages does not appear to support the prevalence or popularity of the Feudal System in ancient India as is claimed by some recent writers. For the payment of *bhakta* and *vetana* to the king's servants including soldiers, in other works, see Sircar, *Landlordism and Tenancy in Ancient and Medieval India as revealed by Epigraphical Records*, p. 41 ; cf. pp. 34-35. See also below, pp. 64-65.

22. *Kāl-ātikramaṇād=dhy=ete bhakta-vetanayor=bhṛtāḥ/*
bhartuḥ kurvanti daurgatyāt so='narthaḥ sumahān smṛtaḥ//

2 Cf. D. C. Boulger, *A Short History of China*, p. 50—"Among soldiers it is necessary to preserve the spirit of pre-eminence and warlike zeal by granting rewards and decorations. Genghis realised the importance of this matter, and instituted the order of Baturu or Bahadur, meaning 'warrior'. He also made his two leading generals Muhula and Porshu princes, one to sit on his right hand and the other on his left. He addressed them before the council in the following words : 'It is to you that I owe my empire. You are and have been to me as the shafts of a carriage or the arms of a man's body.' Seals of office were also granted to all the officials, so that their authority might be the more evident and the more honoured."

M. 39 ; R. 33 : v. l. *°kramaṇād=ete, °kramaṇe hy=eva ; bhartuḥ kupyanti duṣyanti.*

The verse, associated with the previous stanza, says that the persons, who receive from the king wages and allowances for their maintenance, suffer hardship if they are not paid in proper time and, as a result, do great harm to their master.

23. *Kaccit sarve='nuraktās=tvām kulaputrāḥ pradhānataḥ/*
kaccit prāṇāṁs=tav=ārtheṣu saṁtyajanti sadā yudhi//

M. 40 ; R. 34 : v. l. *samāhitāḥ* for *sadā yudhi.*

Importance is attached in this verse to the attachment of all people, including the noble men, to the king, from the highest to the lowest, and their eagerness to offer their lives on the king's behalf.

24. *Kaccit sv-anuṣṭhitā tāta vārtā te sādhubhir=janaiḥ/*
vārtāyāṁ saṁsthitas=tāta loko='yaṁ sukham=edhate//

M. 69 ; R. 47 : v. l. *kaccit=te dayitāḥ sarve kṛṣi-gorakṣā-jīvinaḥ ; sāmpratam* or *saṁśritaḥ* for *saṁsthitaḥ.*

Here importance is attached to *vārtā*, i.e. agriculture, cattle-breeding and trade, being properly carried on in the king's dominions by good people, because the happiness of the subjects greatly depends thereon.

25. *Kaccit striyaḥ sāntvayasi kaccit=tāś=ca surakṣitāḥ/*
kaccin=na śraddadhāsy=āsāṁ kaccid=guhyaṁ
n=ābhāṣase//

M. 73 ; R. 49 : v. l. *tās=te na bhāṣase.*

Here we have reference to the proper treatment of the king's wives and other ladies of the harem. The king is advised to appease and protect the ladies, but not to believe in their statements and to confide any secret to them.

26. *Kaccit=jñātīn gurūn vṛddhān daivatāṁs=tāpasān=api/*
caityāṁś=ca vṛkṣān kalyāṇān Brāhmaṇāṁś=ca namasyasi//

M. 90 ; R. 61 : v. l. *kaccid=gurūṁś=ca vṛddhāṁś=ca tāpasān devat-āthithīn ; caityāṁś=ca sarvān ; devatāḥ* for *daivatān.*

This stanza advises the king to bow down to the elderly kinsmen, other elders, old men, ascetics, auspicious *caitya-*

vṛkṣas (ficus religiosa or any other tree standing on a sacred spot or near the funeral piles) and the Brāhmaṇas. The suggestion here is that the king should follow strictly the Indian code of seemly behaviour towards others.

27. *Kaccid=āryo viśuddh-ātmā kṣāritaś=caura-karmaṇi|*
a-dṛṣṭaḥ śāstra-kuśalair=na lobhād=vadhyate śuciḥ||
M. 93 ; R. 56 : v. l. *āryo='pi* ; *c=āpakarmaṇā.*

It has been said here that, in case a noble man of pure heart is incarcerated on the allegation of theft or any other crime, he should not be killed out of greed for his property without being examined by people who are learned in the *śāstras.* The idea is that the dignity of justice should be maintained ; cf. also the following stanza.

28. *Pṛṣṭo gṛhītas=tatkārī taj-jñair=dṛṣṭaḥ sa-kāraṇaḥ|*
kaccin=na mucyate steno dravya-lobhān=nararṣabha||
M. 94 ; R. 57 ; *gṛhītaś=c=aiva pṛṣṭaś=ca kāle;*
caura for *stena* ; *duṣṭo* for *pṛṣṭo.*

The verse, also referring to the maintenance of the dignity of justice, suggests that, when a person has been interrogated and fettered after experts regarded him as having actually committed theft, the said thief should not be released out of greed for his possessions.

29. *Vyutpanne kaccid=ādhyasya daridrasya ca Bhārata|*
arthān=na mithyā paśyanti tav=āmātyā hṛtā janaiḥ||
M. 95 ; R. 58 : v. l. *vyasane* or *utpannān* for *vyutpanne* ;
durbalasya ca Rāghava | artham virāgāḥ paśyanti tav=
āmātyā bahuśrutāḥ.

According to this stanza, also relating to justice, when there is litigation between a rich and a poor man, the facts should not be wrongly viewed by the king's judicial officers after taking bribes from interested people.

30. *Nāstikyam=anṛtam krodham pramādam dīrghasūtratām|*
adarśanam jñānavatām=ālasyam kṣipta-cittatām||
M. 96 ; R. 65 : *pañca-vṛttitām* for *kṣipta-cittatām.*

This verse, together with the following two (Nos. 31-32), cites the 14 *rāja-doṣas* which a king should avoid. Here in the

present stanza, we have the following 8 out of the 14—(1) atheism, (2) falsehood, (3) anger, (4) carelessness (*pramāda*), (5) dilatoriness (*dīrghasūtratā*), (6) lack of intercourse with wisemen, (7) laziness, and (8) absentmindedness (*kṣipta-cittatā*). The variant *pañca-vṛttitā* seems to mean 'having different attitudes' or 'following various courses of action' at the same time. It is well known that Aśoka enumerates the following among *doṣas* to be avoided by high officers—(1) jealousy (*īrṣā*), (2) anger (*āśulopa*), (3) cruelty (*naiṣṭhurya*), (4) hastiness (*tvaraṇā*), (5) want of perseverance (*anāvṛtti*), (6) laziness (*ālasya*) and (7) fatigue (*klamatha*). See Sircar, *Select Inscriptions*, Vol. I, 1965, pp. 41, 43 ; also *Inscriptions of Aśoka*, 1967, p. 63. It will be seen that anger, laziness and dilatoriness or want of perseverance are common to both the lists.

31. *Eka-cintanam=arthānām=anarthajñaiś=ca cintanam/*
niścitānām=anārambhaṁ mantrasy=āparirakṣaṇam//
M. 97 ; R. 66 : v. l. *mantraṇam* for *cintanam*.

Four out of the 14 *rāja-doṣas*, mentioned in the present stanza, are the following : (1) determination of plans and policies by the king alone, (2) their determination with the help of those who have no experience in such matters, (3) delay in undertaking projects on which decision have been taken already, and (4) failure to preserve the secrecy of schemes. Some of these are alluded to separately above ; cf. Nos. 4, 6, 7.

32. *Maṅgalasy=āprayogaṁ ca prasaṅgaṁ viṣayeṣu ca/*
kaccit=tvaṁ varjayasy=etān=rāja-doṣāṁś=caturdaśa//
M. 98 ; R. 67 : *maṅgal-ādy-aprayogañ=ca pratyutthānaṁ ca sarvataḥ*.

The remaining two of the fourteen *rāja-doṣas* are enumerated in this verse as (1) neglect in the performance of auspicious rites, and (2) excessive addiction to the pleasures of the senses (fighting with the enemies on all fronts at the same time, according to the variant reading). Cf. Nos. 14 and 1-2 above.

33. *Kaccit=te saphalā vedāḥ kaccit=te saphalaṁ dhanam/*
kaccit=te saphalā dārāḥ kaccit=te saphalaṁ śrutam//
M. 99 ; R. 72 : v. l. *saphalāḥ kriyāḥ* for *saphalaṁ dhanam*.

This stanza suggests that the success of the king should be particularly conspicuous in four fields : e.g., (1) his study of the Vedas should be utilised in the proper conducting of Vedic rituals, etc., (2) his wealth should be properly spent in charity, etc. (or, according to the variant reading, his deeds should be characterised by success), (3) he should have wives capable of giving birth to children, and (4) his knowledge of the various sciences should guide him to the successful conclusion of his projects.

VII

ROYAL STRATEGY AND DEFENSIVE WARFARE IN ANCIENT INDIA

Asimkumar Chatterjee, Centre of Advanced Study
in AIHC, Calcutta University

Ancient Sanskrit texts give us plenty of information about the actual administration of the State. They also tell us how a king should behave with his subjects and enemies. There are long lists of directives meant for the king, especially in the different Books of the two epics. Regarding defensive warfare we have not much information either in the Jātakas or in the Vedas. It is only in the *Mahābhārata* that we get a graphic account of how a city was actually defended during a blockade.[1] And when we compare this with some passages scattered in other places of the *Mahābhārata* and the *Arthaśāstra* of Kauṭilya, we get a clear idea about defensive warfare in ancient India. It would be seen that quite a few of the tactics adopted by the defending party were not much different from what is actually done in the present time. As a matter of fact, some of the passages look quite modern.

In the third Book of the *Mahābhārata*, Śālva, the arch-enemy of Kṛṣṇa and a friend of Śiśupāla, is stated to have taken advantage of Vāsudeva Kṛṣṇa's absence and besieged the city of Dvārakā. Being an ally of Śiśupāla who was, in all probability, a victim like Jarāsandha, king of Magada, Śālva wanted to avenge the killing of his friend. From the Sabhā-parvan account, it becomes clear that the unarmed and unattended Śiśupāla was slain by Kṛṣṇa when he came to attend the Rājasūya ceremony of Yudhiṣṭhira.[2] And that is why Śālva bestows on Kṛṣṇa such unflattering epithets as *kṣudraṁ viśvāsaghātinam*[3] and *Vṛṣṇi-kul-ādhama*.[4] He, therefore, devised

1 Cr. ed., III, Ch. 16. All the subsequent references from the *Mahābhārata* are from the Critical edition.

2 See Chs. 37ff.

3 III. 15.12.

4 III. 15.8.

a plan to invest Dvārakā in Kṛṣṇa's absence and, in doing so, was merely trying to pay Kṛṣṇa back in his own coin.

But the Vṛṣṇis, in spite of the absence of their supreme leader, were not unprepared. We are told that the city was well fortified according to the science of fortifications[5] with pennons, arches and combatants and walls and turrets and engines and miners, and streets barricaded with spiked wood-works and offensive weapons and engines for hurling burning brands and fires, and vessels of deer-skins (for carrying water), and trumpets, tabors and drums, lances and forks, and *śataghnīs* and ploughshares, rockets, balls of stone and battle-axe and other weapons and shields embossed with iron and engines for hurling balls and bullets and hot liquids.[6] The names of some of these weapons occur in different places of the *Mahābhārata* and some other Sanskrit texts of antiquity. What strikes us is not the names of weapons, but the various arrangements made by the chiefs of the Vṛṣṇi tribe for defending the city. Ugrasena and Uddhava, the two Vṛṣṇi chiefs, in order to prevent carelessness on the part of the citizens of Dvārakā, proclaimed throughout the city that nobody must drink intoxicating liquors during the siege—

āghoṣitaṁ ca nagare na pātavyā sur=eti ha /
pramādaṁ parirakṣadbhir=Ugrasen-Oddhav-ādibhiḥ //[7]

Apparently the wily chiefs knew too well that a people given to drinking and other amusements are not able to defend themselves, far less to fight. Kauṭilya also, it should be remembered in this connexion, disapproves of drinking.[8] Then the Yādava chiefs, we are told, drove out of the city all mimes and dancers and singers (*naṭa-nartaka-gāyanāḥ*).[9] Such persons were naturally regarded as *persona non grata* by the astute chiefs. This action, on their part, is also supported by what is told in the Śānti-parvan—

5 *Śāstra-dṛṣṭena vidhinā* (III. 16.9).

6 For the original *ślokas*, see *Mbh.*, III. 16.5-8. See also P. C. Roy's trans., Vol. II, p. 37.

7 III. 16.12.

8 VIII. 3 (*✓yasanādhikāram*).

9 *Mbh.*, III. 16.14.

Bhikṣukāṁś=cākrikāṁś=c=aiva klīb-onmattān=kuśīlavān/
bāhyān kuryān=naraśreṣṭha doṣāya syur=hi
te='nyathā //[10]

We are then informed that the Vṛṣṇis caused to be destroyed all the bridges over the adjoining rivers (*saṁkramā bheditāḥ sarve*).[11] This is also strongly supported by the author of the Śānti-parvan[12] and Kauṭilya.[13]

Then, we are told that the boats were forbidden to ply (*nāvaś=ca pratiṣedhitāḥ*)[14] and the trenches around the city were spiked with poles at the bottom. The land around the city, for full two miles, was rendered uneven (*samantāt krośa-mātraṁ ca kāritā viṣamā ca bhūḥ*)[15] and the poles were raised and pits dug thereon. We are further told that at the time of Śālva's approach, nobody was allowed either to enter or to leave the town of the Vṛṣṇis without presenting the seal or sign that had been introduced—

na c=āmudro='bhiniryāti na c=āmudraḥ praveśyate /
Vṛṣṇyandhakapure rājaṁs=tadā Saubha-samāgame //[16]

The issuing of seals or signs to inhabitants during a blockade was at once novel and highly scientific. It is surprising that the celebrated author of the *Arthaśāstra*, who has so many things to say on war (cf. Chs. 7-14), is silent on this. This system of issuing 'pass' was meant to preclude the possibility of intrusion of undesirable and hostile foreign elements into the capital. Naturally, the authorities were extremely sensitive about the activities of spies employed by the enemy-king on whom Kauṭilya is so elaborate.[17] The Vṛṣṇi chiefs also did not leave any stone unturned to satisfy their own soldiers. They were acutely conscious of the fact that a dissatisfied or

10 69.49.
11 *Mbh.*, III. 16.15.
12 69.37—*nadīṣu mārgeṣu sadā saṁkramān=avasādayet.*
13 XII. 4—*nadī-saras-taṭāka-setubandha-bheda-vegena vā plāvayeyuḥ.* See also Shama Sastry's trans., 8th ed., p. 427.
14 *Mbh.*, III. 16.15.
15 *Ibid.*, III. 16.16.
16 *Ibid.*, III. 16.19.
17 See particularly Books XII and XIII of the *Arthaśāstra.*

underpaid army is more a liability than an asset. Kauṭilya, too, observes that soldiers can be made loyal and efficient if they are adequately paid.[18] The/ should also be offered incentives. The Vṛṣṇi chiefs, we are informed, gave their combatants not only adequate pay, but also dress and other equipments—

datta-vetana-bhaktaṁ ca datt-āyudha-paricchadam/
kṛt-āpadānaṁ ca tadā balam-āsīn=mahābhuja//[19]

We further, learn that, among the combatants, there was none who was not somehow obliged, and none who was not of tried valour.[20]

A few other major details, not given in this particular chapter of the Third Book of the *Mahābhārata*, are to be found in the Śānti-parvan (Ch. 69). The most important of the measures prescribed in that Book is what now goes by the phrase 'scorched earth policy'. We are told that the king, if unable to store his grains, should destroy them by fire—

sasy-ābhihāraṁ kuryāc=ca svayam=eva narādhipaḥ/
asambhave praveśasya dāhayed=agninā bhṛśam//[21]

It is well known to the students of history that this tactics was specially employed by the Russians during the invasions of the famous Swedish monarch of the Vasa dynasty, Gustavus Adolphus, and the French emperor Napoleon.

Some other details mentioned in the same Book of the *Mahābhārata* about defensive warfare should also be referred to in this connexion. The defending king, we are told, should set the inhabitants of the wood and, if necessary, cause whole villages to be removed, rehabilitating the inhabitants in what is called *śākhā-nagara*.[22] Such evacuations are also not unknown in modern warfare. It would be realized that rehabilitation of the whole population of a particular place in a different

18 VIII. 5 ; Shama Sastry, *op. cit.*, p. 366.
19 III. 16.21.
20 See verse 22.
21 XII. 69.35.
22 XII. 69.33—

ghoṣān nyasen=mārgeṣuca grāmān=utthāpayed=api/
praveśayec=ca tān sarvān śākhā-nagarakeṣv=api//

region or town was in itself a gigantic task. The whole of the administrative machinery was put to a sort of test during such operations.

The above discussion, though brief, would show that it was only the innate strength and efficiency of the administrative machinery that could save a defending party from annihilation.[23]

23 See in this connexion the Jātaka No. 546 *(Mahā-Ummaga Jātaka)* where Mahosadha, the Bodhisattva, saves Mithilā by adopting some tactics.

VIII

FORMS AND FEATURES OF GOVERNMENTAL SYSTEM IN THE AGE OF THE RĀMĀYAṆA

Upendra Thakur, Magadh University, Bodh-Gaya

Every government by nature is racy of the soil and a reflection of the political standard of the time and the people. As it is the basic desire of the people,[1] they shape it as they like. From the earliest times to the present day, history has recorded various types of government, and the 'governments have been classified according to various principles,...the oldest classification is based upon the number of persons who exercise the highest power in the state', and, according to this principle, 'monarchy is the government of one, aristocracy of a small number, democracy of many'.[2]

Of these forms of government, however, monarchy is the oldest, 'the most ancient, the most widely diffused, the best and the most natural of all forms of government...calculated to ensure identity of interest between the ruler and the ruled'.[3] According to Aristotle, theoretically monarchy ought to be the best form of government if it be assumed that a wise and virtuous king could be found,[4] a fact which is also corroborated by Machiavelli.[5] Beni Prasad holds that the *Jana* once settled on a more or less definite piece of territory, probably including a number of villages, forming a small kingdom, and was headed by a *Rājan*, a king or a chief, normally hereditary. It is just the arrangement which the prevalence of warfare and the totality of social circumstances would *a priori* lead one to expect.[6]

1 *VR*, II.67 ; *Mbh.*, XII. 67-68.

2 W. J. Shepard, in *Encyclopaedia of Social Sciences*, ed. E. R. A. Seligman, Vol. VII, p. 10.

3 J. W. Garner, *Political Science and Government*, p. 338.

4 G. H. Sabine, *A History of Political Theory*, p. 100.

5 *The Discourses* (1.55), quot. *The Prince and Discourses*, p. 285.

6 *The State in Ancient India*, p. 25.

The ordinary form of government in Vedic times was monarchical, a conventional pattern also followed in the *Rāmāyaṇa* age as the *Rāmāyaṇa* knows only of the monarchical form of government—a system in which the head of the State derives his office through hereditary succession. The main features of the monarchical form of government as envisaged in the *Rāmāyaṇa* comprise : (i) key position of the king,[7] (ii) royal blood (hereditary), and (iii) primogeniture, limited and supported by officials and the people. In fact, the king was the key-stone of the kingdom, the centre of political gravity, the symbol of authority vested in a government. Thus, this type of monarchy was clearly based on royal blood, a conventionally established system in which only the elder son was preferred for the post.[8]

In the early days, kingship represented the principle of unity transcending multiplicity, and was the operative criticism of all the institutions that constituted Hindu society. As the king represented the laws of the associations and gathered up and synthesized every interest within himself,[9] a hereditary monarchy served as a powerful means of attaching the masses to the government and of securing their loyalty and obedience. Moreover, it possessed the elements of strength, simplicity of organisation, ability to act quickly, unity of counsel, continuity and consistency of policy and a certain prestige in the conduct of foreign relations.[10]

The *Rāmāyaṇa*, however, does not recognise the absolute or despotic monarchy ; rather it advocates a limited monarchy. It has been rightly suggested that 'the form of government during the *Rāmāyaṇa* period was a limited monarchy'. "People believed in a firm government by a constitutional monarch."[11] It was limited in the sense that *Dharma* was the king of kings as the latter were always to obey the principle of *Dharma* ; it

7 *Ibid.*, p. 107.
8 *VR*, II.3.39-41 ; II.8.24; etc.
9 M. V. K. Rao, *Studies in Kauṭilya*, p. 80.
10 Bagehot, in Garner, *op. cit.*, p. 625.
11 P. C. Dharma, *The Rāmāyaṇa Polity*, p. 12; *VR*. II.115.22; etc.

was limited because the *Purohita*, the ministers and other officials played a vital role in the administration ; it was limited as the people had a vital say in matters of administration.[12]

From a study of the *Rāmāyaṇa*, it is clear that the impartial nature of the king and his simplicity in action, sound and systematic counselling, national solidarity, social harmony, prosperity of the people and of the nation, national defence and well-defined inter-state relations were supposed to be the chief attribute of monarchy. The significance of grand administration, specially the idea of *Rāma-rājya* necessitates a benevolent, limited monarchy given to preserve these high ideals.

But this system of government has its own limitations. It is true that of all other forms of government, monarchy is the most vigorous as in no other system does the will of a single man sway a vaster empire or dominate more easily the will of others.[13] But, then, there is no guarantee that a wise, capable and benevolent person will always succeed to the office. History affords numerous examples of immature, feeble minded and incompetent rulers succeeding to the throne under the operation of such a principle.

During the *Rāmāyaṇa* period monarchy was basically the rule by one man though the king was not a despot as he was advised to rule with the aid and advice of his *Amātyas*, and serve the people to the best of his capacity as this was his *Dharma*. But, despite these pious declarations, we have it on record that the monarchical form of government in the *Rāmāyaṇa* does not provide equal opportunity to all the individuals of the State as in a democratic tradition.[14] It created some sort of a gulf between the people on the basis of participating in the government and enjoying privileges and special facilities.[15]

12 B. G. Gokhale, *Ancient India*, p. 117 ; K. S. Aiyar, *Dharma and Life*, pp. 145-46 ; Altekar, *State and Government in Ancient India*, pp. 98-104 ; V. Pathak, *History of Kosala*, p. 293.

13 E. Barker, *Social Contract : Locke, Hume, Rousseau*, intro., p. 338.

14 Cf. B. N. Mahton, *The Theory of Government in the Rāmāyaṇa*, MS, p. 68.

15 *Ibid.*, p. 69.

How far is it correct to say that the government of the *Rāmāyaṇa* period bore aristocratic elements within its framework ? Aristocracy is usually defined as a form of government in which political power is exercised by the few.[16] Etymologically, aristocracy means the rule of the best, a system which commands itself to common sense as the most rational form of government, its chief characteristic features being quality rather than quantity, character rather than mere numbers.[17] Conservative in character, it honours authority, especially when it has had the sanction of long acquiescence, and has special reverence for long established custom and tradition. Viewed in this context, we find that, though monarchical in form, the government in this age definitely bore some aristocratic elements. The norm of governance, elaborated in the *Rāmāyaṇa*, stresses upon quality to run the administration. Rāma as well as other kings of the line possessed high qualities.[18] The epic unequivocally declares that even the elder son, if he lacked high qualities and possessed vices, was to be deprived of this highest privilege and was to be exiled for his bad conduct.[19] Not only the king, even his *Purohitas*,[20] ministers,[21] generals[22] and other officials must possess high qualities, for even one educated person is better than thousand uneducated.[23] Thus, the scheme of government as formulated in the *Rāmāyaṇa*, has in it a place only for a few high born and highly qualified persons, and this undoubtedly reflects the aristocratic character of the age.

An objective study of the *Rāmāyaṇa* would show that the government in this age was neither completely despotic nor

16 Garner, *op. cit.*, p. 282.

17 L. T. Hobehouse in *Encyclopaedia of Social Sciences*, ed. E. R. A. Seligman, Vol. VII, p. 183.

18 VR, I.1 ; II.2 ; III.19.16 ; V. 35; etc.

19 *Ibid.*, II.36.19-24.

20 *Ibid.*, I.7.6-8 ; II.100.9, 11, etc.

21 *Ibid.*, I.7; II.100.15, etc.

22 *Ibid.*, II.100.30-31.

23 *Ibid.*, II.100.22-24.

aristocratic nor an absolute monarchy. On the other hand, it had some sort of a representative character. In the modern sense, a representative government is a democratic government which rests on active consent of the governed and is not a mere form of government, but a type of State as well as an order of society. The government, during this period, though not fully a government of the people, was certainly the government for the people with the people's consent and co-operation, by the monarch. It was representative in the sense that in some form or other the people were represented in the *Nigama*,[24] *Śreṇī*,[25] *Paura*[26] and *Jānapada*.[27] Although the representation was not wide, these institutions in turn were represented in the national council *(Pariṣad)*,[28] having a voice in the field of governance, such as coronation,[29] general administration, national festivals and *yajñas*.[30] It may therefore be suggested that there was a partial representation system and that the administration was indirectly run through public opinion.[31]

As regards the theocratic character of the government, it can be said that though the government of the age possessed theocratic elements, it was not fully so in the true sense of the term. Theocracy is 'a form of government in which the ultimate sovereignty was assumed to rest in the hands of God or some other superhuman or spiritual being'.[32] There is a distinction between pure theocracy and limited or dualistic theocracy. While the former envisages a supernatural person to rule directly and immediately without the aid of human intermediaries (i.e. the king considered as God himself), the latter

24 *Ibid.*, II.14.40, 54 ; II.15.20.11, 83, etc.

25 *Ibid.*, II.26.14 ; VI. 127.4, 17, etc.

26 *Ibid.*, II.14.40, 54, 69 ; II.26.14, etc.

27 *Ibid.*, II.14.40, 54 ; II.26.14, etc. ; also Bhandarkar, *Aspects of Ancient Hindu Polity*, pp. 105-06.

28 *VR*, II.1-2.

29 *Ibid.*, II.1-2 ; II.14.40-41, etc.

30 *Ibid.*, I.13, e c.

31 *Ibid.*, VII.43, [The picture seems to be a little overdrawn. See the author's discussion below.—Ed.]

32 Garner, *op. cit.*, p. 226.

contemplates a human king as the immediate ruler—and not God—who ruled as his viceregent and acted as the interpreter of the divine will, made known to him by revelation. In other words, he was 'divinized' and sacred,[33] and not God himself.

It is true that the king of the *Rāmāyaṇa* age was sometimes treated as God, possessing all the divine qualities,[34] his place being among such divinities as Agni, Indra, Sūrya and Vāyu.[35] The Brāhmaṇa or *Purohita* played a vital role in the maintenance of the government and was the religious teacher, political adviser and philosopher placed traditionally at the top of the hierarchy of the social system.[36] Moreover, the system also emphasised the importance of *Satya*,[37] *Karman*,[38] *Yajña*,[39] etc., besides *Dharma*[40] which added to the stability of the theocratic system. But a close perusal of the above aspects would show that the king in fact was not permanently recognized either as the symbol of God or his representative. He was practically not bound to follow the directions of the Brāhmaṇas as is evident from several examples. For instance, the desire of the Brāhmaṇas to coronate Rāma as king was ignored and he was exiled.[41] Again, the Brāhmaṇas desired that Bharata should be coronated ; but the latter ignored their advice.[42] All this shows that the Brāhmaṇas were simply counsellors and not the supreme controlling authorities, and that their advice could be ignored by the kings as and when it did not suit them.

Moreover, there is no mention in the *Rāmāyaṇa* of any established religious institution to run the administration like

33 *Ibid.*, pp. 226-28 ; D. M. Brown, *The White Umbrella*, pp. 17-18 ; Altekar, *op. cit.*, p. 53.

34 *VR*, II.67.35 ; II.102.4, etc.

35 *Ibid.*, VII.1, 20-21.

36 *Ibid.*, I.1.33-34 ; I.7, etc.

37 *Ibid*, II.14.3 ; II.109, etc.

38 *Ibid.*, II.63.6-9 ; II.64.13, etc.

39 *Ibid.*, II.105.34-35 ; VII. 25.8-9, etc.

40 *Ibid.*, I.9.8-9 ; II.21.41, 58, etc.

41 *Ibid.*, II.1-40.

42 *VR*, II.79-80.

the Church of mediaeval Europe, or the Caliphs of the Muslim world, or the Dalai Lama of Tibet or the Pope of the Vatican kingdom.[43] Here the king himself is the political institution, 'the central pivot round whom evolved all the norms of the government'.[44] It cannot, therefore, be treated as theocratic, although it possessed certain theocratic elements.

In fact, the system of government as revealed in the *Rāmāyaṇa*, is a trusteeship type which had both the theoretical and practical sanctions. This trusteeship theory suggests that the whole possession of the king or the kingdom is not for one's own sake, but for the entire society, and the possess or of it is simply keeper, custodian or trustee of it, who acts not in his own interest, but in the right of the community and should be given a fair commission commensurate with the value of service rendered to the society.

The trusteeship feature of the government in the *Rāmāyaṇa* is based upon the sacrificial theory which meant that the existence of the government is for the benefit of the whole society. The living example of this trusteeship nature we have in Bharata's request to Rāma, while in the forest, to return to Ayodhyā to rule over the kingdom, which was turned down by Rāma on the ground that to obey the will of the father is the greatest *Dharma*. He, however, handed over his pair of sandals to Bharata who accepted it as his representative, brought it to Ayodhyā, enthroned it and served the society as the servant of Rāma.[45] When Rāma came back to Ayodhyā after fourteen years of exile, Bharata received him with a deep sense of relief and returned the kingdom to him saying that he was the proper authority to rule over the kingdom for the protection and welfare of the people.[46] Thus, it is clear from the above that, for all practical purposes, the government was for the people, and not the people for the government which in turn generated

43 B. N. Mahton, *op. cit.*, p. 75.
44 *Loc. cit.*
45 *VR*, II.115.
46 *Ibid.*, I.1.37 ; II.112 ; II.113.12-14, etc.

the sense of honest duty and sacrifice, though, in the case of Rāvaṇa, it cannot be accepted without reservation.

Besides the trusteeship nature, it can further be suggested that the norms of the government in the *Rāmāyaṇa* conformed more or less to those of a welfare State. In fact, a welfare State is 'a State that provides for its citizens a wide range of social services'.[47] The government in this age basically stood for welfare, prosperity, peace and security, and also law and order in society,[48] the supreme duty of the king being an honest and sincere discharge of duties in the larger interest of the society, i.e. the general welfare of the people in all walks of life—social, economic and cultural.

From the structural point of view, the government as depicted in the *Rāmāyaṇa* appears to be unity, i.e., a system 'where the whole power of government is conferred by the constitution upon a single central organ or organs from which the local governments derive whatever authority or autonomy they may possess'.[49] It is characteristic of this form of government that there is no constitutional distribution of power between the Central Government of the State and the subordinate local governments. In this system, the authorities are conceived as creatures of the Central Government and as exercising their legal powers by delagation from the same.[50] In this age, the States were small which made the structure of the government simple and its size small. All power was centralised at one place, the capital,[51] which pratically managed the administration of the whole kingdom. True, there were many institutions in the kingdom ; but these were not like the constituent parts of the Federal State.

The unitary structure is often better than the federal one as it is a simpler organisation and is less expensive than the Federal Government due to the lack of duplication of central

47 T. W. Kent, quoted by E. Asirvatham, *Political Theory*, p. 184.

48 *VR*, II.67.

49 Garner, *op. cit.*, p. 317.

50 W. J. Shepard, *op. cit.*, p. 10.

51 Cf. *VR*, IV.40.22-23 ; IV.41.8-12 ; I.5 ; II.46.4 ; II.51.21-23, etc.

and local authorities and services.[52] This was exactly the position of the government of this age, which was more suited to the geographical, economic, racial and political conditions of the people.[53] Moreover, in times of emergency the government took quick decisions and implemented them promptly as can be seen in the case of Rāvaṇa, Daśaratha and others. At the same time, it was absolutely free from internal disturbances and provided much better administration which in turn paved the way for national unity and solidarity

52 Garner, *op. cit.*, p. 379.
53 B. N. Mahton, *op. cit.*, p. 80.

IX

AMĀTYA SEALS

Kirankumar Thaplyal, Lucknow University

Several sealings from Bhita, Basarh, Rajghat and other sites, ascribable to the Kuṣāṇa and early Gupta periods, belong to the *Amātyas* or their sons.

A terracotta sealing from Bhita[1] bears a *cakra*, a *śaṅkha*, the *śrīvatsa*[2] symbol and the legend in characters of the fourth or fifth century A.D.—*Amāty-Eśvaracandrasya* ([seal] of *Amātya* Īśvaracandra).[2a] Another sealing from the same site and of about the same period bears the legend *Amāty-Eśvar*[*ā*]*na*[*na*].[3] One of the two impressions on No. 37[4] in Marshall's list of Bhita seals bears a fan-tailed peacock on a pedestal and the legend *Amātya-Dharmadevasya* in Gupta characters. No. 38[5] of the same list bears the same legend, but has no device, while No. 39[6] bears a *śrīvatsa* symbol and the legend *Bolasya* in Kuṣāṇa characters. Likewise, No. 40[7] shows a *śrīvatsa* symbol. The legend reads *Amātya-Nāgadāma* in characters of the second or third century A.D.[8]

Basarh has yielded only one *Amātya* sealing. It bears the following two-line legend : (1) [*A*]*mātya-Bhadrika-putrasya* (2) [*A*]*mātya-Hastabalasya*[9] ([seal] of *Amātya* Hastabla, son of *Amātya* Bhadrika).

A Mathura Museum sealing[10] bears the two-lined legend :

---

1 *ASI. AR*, 1911-12, p. 53, No. 36, Pl. XIX.

2 Described as an 'uncertain symbol' by Marshall (*ibid.*, p. 53).

2a It is possible to break the legend as *Amātyeśvara-Candra* ; but *amātyeśvara*, as a title, is unknown.

3 *Ibid.*, p. 54, No. 41. This shows *śaṅkha* as a device.

4 *Ibid.*, p. 53, No. 37A, Pl. XIX.

5 *Ibid.*, p. 54, No. 38, Pl. XIX.

6 *Ibid.*, p. 54.

7 *Loc. cit.*

8 Another impression on this lump, like that on No. 37 (*ibid.*, p. 53), shows a *nandipada* and the legend *Vārasya*.

9 *ASI. AR*, 1913-14, p. 134, No. 210, Pl. XLVII.

10 I owe this information to Prof. K. D. Bajpai.

(1) *Amātyasya* (2) *Upalihamasa* ([seal] of *Amātya* Upalihama).

A Rajghat sealing in the Allahabad Museum[11] shows a couchant bull, and the legend *Amātyakasya*. Another from the same site has the legend *Amacanaṁ* (Sanskrit *Amātyānām*) i.e. 'seal of the *Amātyas*'. We may refer here to a British Museum seal of an unknown provenance bearing the legend *Amātyasya*.[12]

A large number of Rajghat seals bear the legend *Amātya-Janārdanasya* and show the device of a humped bull seated to left.[13] The characters of the letters resemble those of Samudragupta's Allahabad pillar inscription. Motichandra, therefore, surmises that *Amātya* Janārdana looked after the regions around Varanasi in the time of king Samudragupta.[14]

A Rajghat sealing in the Bhārat Kalā Bhavan[15] has a *svastika* and the legend *Amātyaputra-Kalabhakasya* in early Gupta characters. Another bears the device of a bull and the legend *Amātya-Kapilakasya* in similar characters. Still another in the same collection[16] has the legend *Amātya Āryaśarma* in characters of the same age.

Sealing No. 6369 in the Bhārat Kalā Bhavan collection bears the device of a seated bull and the legend *Amaca Hatthikasa* in Kuṣāṇa characters. The same device and legend occur on a fair number of sealings from the same site. Sealings Nos. 6233 and 6235 in the Bhārat Kalā Bhavan bear similar device; but the legends thereon are *Hastika* and *Hastikasya* respectively. In the absence of the title *Amātya*, it is difficult to say whether these refer to the same person. Another sealing from the same site in the State Museum, Lucknow,[17] shows three

11 No. 149.

12 *JNSI*, Vol. XXII, p. 125, No. 17, Pl. V. 16.

13 These are housed in several museums of India—Allahabad Museum (Nos. 14, 30, 69, 73, 80, 103, 128, 131-32, 162 and 178); Lucknow Museum (Nos. 40, 152); Bhārat Kalā Bhavan (Nos. 63-67); Antiquity section of the Archaeological Survey of India, New Delhi; Chhatrasal Museum, Banda; etc.

14 *Kāśī kā Itihās*, p. 91.

15 No. 6371.

16 No. 6362.

17 Nos. 49.189.

symbols, a *triśūla-paraśu*, a *cakra* and spear with flying pennons, and has the legend *Amātya-Varadatta*. The reverse shows cross string-marks. Another sealing acquired from the same site shows a bull, standing facing a *yūpa* and the legend *Amātya-Bolaka*.[18] Sealings of *Amātya* Śoṇa,[19] *Amātya* Śrīdvārika[20] and *Amātya* Boṭa[21] have also been found there.

The find of a fairly good number of *Amātya* seals is suggestive of the importance and numerical strength of this category of officers. This is also suggested by the fact that one Kalabhaka, who himself did not hold any office, styles himself as the son of an *Amātya* and does not even care to give the name of his father.*

The names of some *Amātyas*, for example, Janārdana and Hastika, occur on a large number of sealings from Rajghat, while those of others occur on one or on a few only. Perhaps the latter were sent by the *Amātyas* from outside along with some correspondence, while the former who had their origin at the find-spot. The presence of string-marks on the back of these sealings indicate that they were attached to some documents and, in the case of *Amātya* Janārdana, is suggestive of parties entering into contracts in the presence or with the approval of these officials who maintained copies of these in their record room for reference. The sealing mentioning *Amātya* Hastabala, son of *Amātya* Bhadrika, may suggest the hereditary character of that office. Literary[22] and epigraphic[23]

18 In the Dept. of Anc. Ind. Hist., Cult. and Arch., B.H.U., No. 470.

19 *JNSI*, Vol. XXIII, p. 412.

20 *Ibid.*, p. 413.

21 *Loc. cit.*

*[The case is similar to that of the Kannaḍa family name *Birādar* which is a Persian word meaning 'brother', but really means here 'the Pāṭil's brother and representative'. See *JAIH*, Vol. III, pp- 267-68.—Ed.]

22 Manu, VII. 54; Yājñavalkya (Ānandāśrama ed.), 1.310; *Bṛhaspati*, 1.71.

23 *CII*, Vol. III, No. 6, p. 35, line 3. Vīrasena calls himself one who hereditarily obtained the post of *Saciva (anvaya-prāpta-sācivya)*. In *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. X, p. 71, Minister Pṛthivīsena was the son of Minister Śikharasvāmin. For seven Candella rulers being served by five generations of ministers, see *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. I, pp. 196 ff.; cf. R. K. Dikshit, in *Uttara Bhārati*, Vol. VI, p. 81.

evidence also attests to the hereditary character of similar offices.

The presence of the *śaṅkha*, *cakra* and *śrīvatsa* on the seals of Īśvaracandra and the *śrīvatsa* on those of *Amātyas* Boḷa and Nāgadāma suggests their Vaiṣṇava leanings. Janārdana and Kapilaka had the bull as a device and may have been Śaivas. The seal of Dharmadeva has a peacock device which may suggest that he was a devotee of Kārttikeya.

Nothing can be said with certainty regarding the caste of the *Amātyas* except that of *Amātya* Āryaśarman who, as his name-ending suggests, was a Brāhmaṇa. Some ancient authorities favour the appointment of Brāhmaṇas to this office.[24]

The terms *amātya*, *mantrin* and *saciva* have sometimes been regarded as synonymous, but sometime treated differently.[25] The term *mantrin* is found on a single sealing ;[26] no sealing with the epithet *Saciva* has so far come to our notice. It has been stated that 'in post-Mauryan times *Amātyas* were more commonly known as *Sacivas*'.[27] The evidence of the seals, however, points just the other way.

---

24 Manu, VIII. 58 ; Bṛhaspati, I. 71.

25 Manu seems to equate *Saciva* (VII. 54) and *Amātya* (VII. 60). The *Rāmāyaṇa* refers to Sumantra as a *Mantrin* at one place (1.8.4) and *Amātya* at another (1.7.2-3). The *Amarakośa* takes *mantrin*, *dhīsaciva* and *amātya* as synonyms and distinguishes them from the *karmasaciva*. The *Arthaśāstra* lays down that a king should appoint three or four *Mantrins*, but as many *Amātyas* as deemed necessary (I.15). The *Śukranīti* seems to regard *Saciva* (II.94), *Amātya* (II.103-06) and *Mantrin* (II.95) respectively as army minister, revenue minister and the chief counsellor. The *Kāmandakīya Nītisāra* (IV. 24-30) attests to greater importance of a *Mantrin* in comparison to an *Amātya*. [The *Śukranīti* is supposed by some to be a modern work. For a distinction between *Amātya* and *Mantrin*, see Sircar, *Ind. Ep.*, p. 356, notes 5.—Ed.]

26 A sealing from Sirkap bears the legend *Sihasa [Madri]na putasa Virabāhusa* in both Brāhmī and Kharoṣṭhī scripts. The legend has been translated as '[seal] of Vīrabāhu, son of *Mantrin* Siṁha' (Marshall, *Taxila*, Vol. II, p. 681, No. 27). The possibility of *Madrina* being a personal name cannot be ruled out. [That is unlikely.—Ed.]

27 R. S. Sharma, *Aspects of Political Ideas and Institutions in Ancient India*, p. 17.

Ancient Indian texts emphasize their necessity and importance[28] as well as their qualifications.[29] The term *amātya* came to denote a general class of officers who were assigned numerous duties and offices. The *Arthaśāstra*,[30] Buddhist texts[31] and even the account of the Greek ambassador, Megasthenes,[32] would testify to it. The *Amātyas* of these seals and sealings would, as such, have performed various administrative duties.

28 *Amātya* has been taken as one of the seven *prakṛtis* of State (*Arthaśāstra*, VI. 1. ; Manu, IX. 294. ; Viṣṇu, I. 3.33) ; for their importance, see also Manu, VII. 55; *Arthaśāstra*, I. 7.

29 Yājñavalkya (Ānandāśrama ed.), I. 310 ; *Rāmāyaṇa*, 1.7 ; *Bṛhaspati*, I. 71.

30 *Arthaśāstra*, VIII. 1.23-24.

31 See Fick, *The Social Organization of North-East India in Buddha's Time*, pp. 144-51.

32 Cf. the duties of councillors and assessors as enumerated by Megasthenes (Mc'Crindle, *India as described by Megasthenes and Arrian*, p. 85).

X

THE ROLE OF MAHĀJANAS IN SOUTH INDIAN ADMINISTRATION

O. P. Verma, Nagpur University

The Institution of the Mahājanas is an important aspect of South Indian Administrative system. It is an important link in the local self-government. These Mahājanas had a number of duties to perform. They used to act as trustees and bankers, look after schools, tanks and rest houses, raise subscriptions for a public purpose and pay village dues to the Central Government. So far as the local administration was concerned, they were an influential body.

The earliest mention of the Mahājanas is noticed in a sixth century record[1] of the Gaṅga king Durvinīta in which the Mahājanas of Maṇiyaṭegare, Asimbāḷa, Nandiyāḷa and other places figure as witnesses to a grant. The term *Mahājana* has been differently interpreted. While some writers take them to be Brāhmaṇas who received shares in the *agrahāras*,[2] others are of the opinion that they included all the adult population of the village. According to the latter view, all the village householders were members of the Mahājana Assembly. However, a Cālukya inscription[3] of 1049 A.D. mentions 120 Mahājanas of Pombukha and also its *aśeṣa-brahma-sabhā*, the assembly of the Brāhmaṇas of the place, indicating thereby that the Mahājanas of a place did not always comprise the entire body of its householders. The institution of Mahājanas continued to exist as late as the 14th century A.D. Although it had its unique features in South Indian history, it was known differently in different regions such as Mahattamas in North India,

1 *MAR*, 1924, pp. 70-71, No. 79.

2 Altekar, *The Rāṣṭrakūṭas and their Times*, pp. 201ff.; R. C. Majumdar, *Corporate Life In Ancient India*, pp. 153ff.; T. V. Mahalingam, *South Indian Polity*, p. 395.

3 *SII*, Vol. XI (i), No. 84, lines 11-12.

Mahattaras in Maharashtra,* Mahājanas in Karnataka and Perumakkāl in the Tamil country.

The Mahājanas were thus members of the village community in whom not only the people, but the ruler of the territory also had great trust. They were all learned in the Vedas, Śāstras, grammar, rhetoric, Purāṇa and *kāvya*, performers of Soma sacrifices, regular in their daily routine of religious duties and examplary citizens of noble character. A Kannaḍa record[4] of the reign of Yādava Kṛṣṇa contains an interesting description of 120 Mahājanas of Puvina-Padaṅgile as *ripukula-kadali-vana-kuñjarar* and *śaraṇāgata-vajra-pañjarar*. It indicates that the Mahājanas of the locality did not hesitate to take up arms against a sudden attack of the aggressors.

There was no grant which the king of a locality donated without obtaining the assent of the Mahājanas.** The Managoli inscription[5] of Cālukya Jagadekamalla II, dated 1161 A.D., states that the king made a grant with the assent of the 500 Mahājanas of Maṇiṁgavalli headed by *Mahāprabhu* Mādirāja. A Kannaḍa inscription[6] of Rāṣṭrakūṭa Kṛṣṇa II records a gift by 300 Mahājanas and another dated 902-03 A.D. refers to a gift by a number of Brāhmaṇas with the approval of 120 Mahājanas. An inscription of Western Cālukya Ttailokyamalla, dated 1053-54 A.D., registers the gift of a garden, a 'wet' field, five houses and one oil-mill for the worship of Jina by 120 Mahājanas of Raccuru.[7] The Mahājanas of the *rājadhānipaṭṭana* Purigere were present with two *Daṇḍanāyakas* and some others on the occasion when, in 1138 A.D., the Kadamba prince Jayakeśin made an important gift to the Śiva temple of the locality.[8] Similarly, the presence of the Mahājanas was

---

*[The designation *Mahattara* was not confined to Maharashtra.—Ed.]

4 *Ibid.*, No. 371.

**[The statement is not strictly accurate.—Ed.]

5 *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. V, p. 9.

6 *Ibid.*, Vol. XIII, p. 190.

7 *GER*, 1919, p. 16.

8 BK No. 3 of 1935-36.

required when there was a purchase[9] or sale[10] of land. It seems that the social and economic affairs were in the hands of the Mahājanas whose permission was obtained before a piece of land was given away to a temple (*mahājana-prajā-sammatade-koṭṭadu*,[11] i.e. given away with the assent of the subjects who were Mahājanas).

The Mahājanas usually met collectively at a place which may be either a school,[12] a temple[13] or their own Assembly Hall[14] which was called *ghaṭige*. Sometimes they met in the open. The Mahājanas of Hosaholalu assembled below the banyan tree at the northern gate of the *agrahāra*.[14] In some of their meetings, children and old people were also present. In an inscription from Nandavadige in the Bijapur District, the Mahājanas of the place, with their children and old people, were present in order to make a gift.[15]

The Mahājana Assembly either met voluntarily, or was convened by the ruler of the locality. In 1053 A.D., the Kadamba *Mahāmaṇḍaleśvara* Harikesarin sent a summoner to the 300 Mahājanas of Niriḷi, convened them, washed their feet and made over the house-tax to them for the expenses of the tank known as Piriyakere.[16] The decisions of the Mahājanas were generally unanimous. This was achieved through a consensus which is expressed by the phrase *ubhaya-sammata*.[17] The Mahājanas desired that their rules should be acceptable to all for all time. Therefore their decisions were committed to writing and copies thereof were carved on stone for the notice of the public.[18] The nature of the assembly's business may

---

9 *Ibid.*, No. 2.
10 *Ibid.*, No. 15.
11 *Ibid.*, No. 16 of 1933-34.
12 *SII*, Vol. IX (i), No. 162.
13 *Ibid.*, No. 254.
14 *MAR*, 1915, p. 56.
15 *Ind. Ant.*, Vol. XII, p. 221.
16 *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. XVI, p. 66.
17 *SII*, Vol. IX (i), No. 59.
18 *Ep. Carn.*, Vol. IX, Cp. 77.

be noticed in the following : "We, the members of the assembly at Vandur, assembled without a vacancy in the assembly, made a grant of certain lands as *devadāna* exempt from taxes .. and gave a *śāsanam* to the effect. By the direction of the members of the Assembly, a servant of the *gāvuṇḍa* of Kiḷalai-nāḍu, wrote the *śāsanam*."[19] In another place, the stone-mason is said to have engraved the *śāsanam*.[20]

The Mahājanas were very keen on their rules being obeyed by those for whom they were meant. They did not merely stop at cursing those who violated them. They called such violaters *grāmadohi*[21] and fined them suitably. In this, they had the support of the Central Government in enforcing their rules. An equally powerful sanction for their rules lay in the threat of excommunication from the community.[22] While the Mahājanas were anxious that their rules should be obeyed, they could also foresee that at times the rules might lead to difficulties in the matter of execution. Hence they promised that, if any dispute arose as a result of their rules, they would settle it themselves.[23] A dispute arose over the right of worship in the Aragalur temple. The judge referred the complicated issues to the Mahājanas of several *agrahāras* and ultimately endorsed their decision.[23]

Let us now consider the various duties performed by the Mahājanas in the backdrop of village administration. In 1075 A.D., the 1000 Mahājanas of Lokkigundi headed by their Uroḍeya met and granted for the god Maruḷeśvara the income from the tax on an oil-mill and an orchard.[24] In 1119 A.D., the Mahājanas of Bāḷguḷi met and assigned part of a tank for the expenses of lighting a temple.[25]

To provide for the requirements of a subsidiary shrine in

19 *Ibid.*, Cp. 132.
20 *Ibid.*, Cp. 77.
21 *SII*, Vol. IX (i), No. 344, line 59.
22 *Ep. Carn.*, Vol. VI, Tk. 55.
23 *Ibid.*, Vol. V, Pt. ii, Ak. 120, lines 27ff.
24 *KI*, Vol. II, pp. 26-27.
25 *SII*, Vol. IX (i), No. 198.

the Rāmeśvara temple and the repairs of the *gopura* in front of the main temple, the 400 Mahājanas of Nāgai met and resolved as follows :[26] For the regular worship and periodical festivals in the shrine of Lakṣmaṇa, a contribution of one-sixteenth of the proceeds of the sale of cloth and areca-nuts should be paid in gold by the local merchants as well as by itinerant merchants visiting the village.

For effecting repairs to the *gopura* were to be set apart all moneys including *mudrā-paṇa* paid by those who fulfilled their vows before the deity.

An inscription of Cālukya Someśvara II, dated 774-75 A.D., refers to the grant of a village to the 300 Mahājanas of another village for the maintenance of the cult of Rāmeśvara in a third locality.[27]

The Nargund inscription records an elaborate arrangement for compulsory contributions for a local tank on occasions like marriage, thread ceremony, etc.[28] In 1028 A.D., the 70 Mahājanas of Signur met and contributed towards the expenses of a local tank.[29] The 200 Mahājanas led by the Uroḍeya of Jenevāḍi were present on the occasion when a large gift of land was made in 1040 A.D. to a feeding house.[30]

It will be seen from the above that the Mahājanas played an important role in a village. They dominated all aspects of the village affairs and were the spokesmen of the village. Gifted with learning, they evoked respect from the inhabitants of the village as well as from the ruler of the territory, who granted them certain privileges such as a golden pot, six white umbrellas, chowries, the *pañcamahāśabda*, the *ghaṭika* and the big drum.[31]

---

26 *HAS*, Vol. VIII, No. 3, lines 6-11.

27 *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. XVI, p. 69. [The two dates in the record are 1074 and 1075 A.D.—Ed.]

28 *Ind. Ant.*, Vol. XII, p. 224.

29 *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. XV, p. 329ff.

30 *Ibid.*, p. 335.

31 *SII*, Vol. V. No. 849.

XI

ADMINISTRATIVE SYSTEM OF THE LATER SOMAVAṀŚĪS

K. S. Behera, Utkal University, Bhubaneswar

Indraratha was the last great ruler of the first phase of Somavaṁśī history. The defeat of Indraratha at the hands of Paramāra Bhoja[1] of Malwa and Rājendracoḷa,[2] the consequent chaos that followed, made the ministers to choose Yayāti II Caṇḍihara as the 'Lord of Kaliṅga, Koṅgoda, Utkala and Kosala'.[3] The Brahmeśvara inscription mirrors the chaotic condition created by the combatant kings by stating that 'when he (Dharmaratha), Rājamalla (the best of kings), departed unto heaven without issue, all his kingdom was laid waste by various warriors of different countries; there was a lapse of short and eventless time. Then Caṇḍihara, son of Abhimanyu and grandson of Vicitravīra, lineal descendant of the celebrated Janamejaya, was made king by the ministers; and he was powerful and spirited like his father'.[4] Thus Yayāti II gave a new lease of life to the dynasty by liberating the land from foreign domination. He brought about the unification Kosala and Utkala under one sceptre.[5] He called himself *Mahārājādhirāja*, *Paramamāheśvara* and *Trikaliṅg-ādhipati*. He is compared to many famous kings like Nala, Nahuṣa, Māndhātṛ, Dilīpa, Bharata and Bhagīratha. In the Narasimhapur plates[6] of Uddyotakesarin, he is represented as conqueror of the world, the representative of Madhusūdana. The Brahmeśvara inscription of the time of Uddyotakesarin says that 'he reigned impartially cherishing all his servants, ministers, people, those who sought

1 *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. I, pp. 222-38.

2 K. A. N. Sastri, *The Coḷas*, pp. 248-49.

3 *JBORS*, Vol. II, pp. 45-55. [Caṇḍihara may be called Yayāti III. —Ed.]

4 *JASB*, Letters, Vol. XIII, p. 72.

5 *JBORS*, Vol. XVIII, pp. 1-15.

6 *JBORS*, Vol. XVIII, pp. 1-15.

refuge, kinsmen and desired friends and made both the kingdoms indisputable'. Uddyotakesarin, who succeeded Yayāti II, is styled as *Paramamāheśvara, Paramabhaṭṭāraka, Mahārājādhirāja, Soma-kula-tilaka* and *Trikaliṅg-ādhipati*. The Ratnagiri charter[7] shows that these imperial titles continued to be used till the time of Karṇadeva, the last ruler of the dynasty.

The city of Yayātinagara was the capital of the Somavaṁśis. We have a contemporary account of the city. The inscriptions of Yayāti I and Bhīmaratha show that it was situated on the banks of the Mahānadī. S.N. Rajaguru believes that the correct identification of Yayātinagara would be with a place on the banks of the Mahānadī near Kantilo in the Khandapara Sub-Division where many ancient monuments, including the temple of Nilamādhava, are seen.[8] N. K. Sahu suggests that it is to be identified with Jaktinagar in Baud.[9] With the gradual extension of the empire and the unification of Kosala and Utkala under Yayāti II, the capital seems to have been transferred to Utkala. The second Yayātinagara, from which later Somavaṁśī kings like Uddyotakesarin and Karṇadeva issued their copper plates, is to be identified with Jājpur in Cuttack district.*

As regards the activities of the Somavaṁśī queens, it is known from the Brahmeśvara inscription that Kolāvatī, queen of Yayāti II and mother of Uddyotakesarin, caused to be erected the temple for Brahmeśvara (Śiva) at Ekāmra. The Ratnagiri plates of Karṇadeva registers a grant in favour of *Rāṇī* śrī-Karpūraśrī who hailed from the *Mahāvihāra* of Solaṇapura. She appears to have been a *Devadāsī* attached to the Buddhist *Mahāvihāra* of Solaṇapura.**

The influence of subordinate kings in the administrative system is evident from the inscriptions. Often, the ruler is

7 *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. XXXIII, pp. 263-74.

8 *Inscriptions of Orissa*, Vol. IV, Bhubaneswar, 1966, p. 373.

9 *History of Orissa*, Vol. I, Utkal University, 1964, p. 137.

*[See Sircar, *Stud. Geog.*, 1st ed., 1960, p. 146 ; 2nd ed., 1971, p. 179 ; cf. *JIH*, Vol. XXXIV, 1956, pp. 263ff.—Ed.]

**[See Sircar, *Stud. Rel. Life*, pp. 202-03 ; also *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. XXXIII, 1959-1960, pp. 271ff. The name of the place is 'Saloṇapura'.—Ed.]

described as one 'at whose feet bowed many *Rājanyas*' (*praṇamita-rājany - opasevita-pad-āravinda-yugala.*[10] The Kudopali plates[11] of the time of Mahābhavagupta (apparently Uddyotakesarin)* shows that a *Māṇḍalika* named *Rāṇaka* śrī-Puñja was ruling over Bāmaṇḍāpaṭṭi which has been identified with modern Bāmaṇḍā.

Of the high ministers, mention is made of the *Mahākṣapaṭalādhyakṣa* and *Mahāsandhivigrahin*. The *Sandhivigrahin* (the minister for peace and war) was also entrusted with the drafting of royal charters. The office was held hereditarily by the Datta family. *Rāṇaka* Rudradatta, nephew of Siṁhadatta and grandson of Harṣadatta, was the *Sandhivigrahin* during the time of Yayāti II.[12] He also continued as *Mahāsandhivigrahin* during the time of Uddyotakesarin.[13] In the time of Janamejaya II, *Rāṇaka* Malladatta II was the *Sandhivigrahin*, and he was probably a successor of Rudradatta.

In the list of persons receiving information about the king's grant of land, the Somavaṁśī records include *Samāhartṛ*, *Sannidhātṛ*, *Niyuktādhikārin*, *Dāṇḍapāśika*, *Cāṭa*, *Bhaṭa*, *Piśuna*, *Vetrika*, *Avarodhajana*, *Rājñī*, *Rāṇaka*, *Rājaputra*, *Rājavallabha*, *Bhogijana*, etc. As regards territorial administration, the empire was divided into *maṇḍala* (province), *viṣaya* (district), *khaṇḍa* (sub-division of a district) and *grāma*.

A striking feature of the administrative system of the later Somavaṁśis was the appointment of sub-kings from among the princes of the royal family. Under Uddyotakesarin, the empire was divided into two parts, the coastal portion was under the direct control of the king with its capital at Yayātinagara,

10 Jatesinga-Dungri plates of Mahāśivagupta Yayāti, *JBORS*, Vol. II, pp. 45-55 ; cf. *kṣitipāla-mauli-saṁlīna-ratna-cumbita-pādapīṭha* of the Ratnagiri charter of Karṇadeva.

*[See *IHQ*, Vol. XX, 1944, p. 80.—Ed.]

11 *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. IV, pp. 254-59.

12 *JBORS*, Vol. II, pp. 45-55. For a genealogical table of the Dattas, vide S. N. Rajaguru, *Inscriptions of Orissa*, Vol. IV, p. 381. [See *IHQ*, *op. cit.*, pp. 78-79.—Ed.]

13 *JBORS*, Vol. XVII, pp. 1-15.

while the Kosala (South Kosala) portion was ruled by the collateral branch with headquarters at Suvarṇapura (modern Sonepur). The division of the empire seems to be deliberate and was done from the standpoint of political and military considerations. As D. C. Sircar observes, "This arrangement may have been made to check the Kalacuri as well as Chindaka-Nāga and Telugu-Coḍa encroachment in Kosala and Gaṅga encroachment in Utkala."[14] The Kelga plates[15] show that Uddyotakesarin assigned the Kosala kingdom to Abhimanyu who was undoubtedly a relation of the king. It is generally believed that *Kumāra* Someśvaradeva, who succeeded Abhimanyu, was the last ruler of this collateral branch, and after him the territory came to be occupied by the Chindaka-Nāga and Telugu-Coḍa rulers. But a set of three copper plates recently discovered by me at the village of Nuapatna (P.S. Tigiria, Dist. Cuttak) shows that the administrative arrangement of the Somavaṁśis for Western Orissa was in tact in the fifth regnal year of Janamejaya II. The charter was issued in the said year *(pañcame saṁvatsare)* of *Paramamāheśvara, Paramabhaṭṭāraka, Mahārājādhirāja, Soma-kula-tilaka, Trikaliṅg-ādhipati* śri-Janamejaya who is to be identified with Janamejaya II, successor of Uddyotakesarin. Dharmarathadeva, the donor of the grant is described as the ruler of *Paścima-Kaliṅga* (literally, 'Western Kaliṅga') having imperial titles *(Paścima-Kaliṅg-ādhipati-Mahākumārādhirāja-Parameśvara-Yuvarāja-Śrī-Dharmarathadevavarmā kuśali)*. The charter resembles the Kelga plates of the Somavaṁśi *Kumāra* Someśvaradeva, for there are identical passages like *Paramamāheśvara-Paramabhaṭṭāraka-Soma-kula-kamala-kalikā-vikāsa-bhāskara*, which show that the charters could not be far removed from each other in time. But there are some differences between the two. While in the Kelga plates, *Kumāra* Someśvara is described as *Paścima-Laṅk-ādhipati* and *Kumārādhirāja*, the Nuapatna copper plates call *Yuvarāja* Dharmarathadeva as *Paścima-Kaliṅg-ādhipati* and *Mahākumārādhirāja*. It

14 *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. XXVIII, p. 324.

15 *Ibid.*, pp. 321-28.

appears that *Paścima-Laṅkā* of the Kelga plates is a mistake for *Paścima-Kaliṅga** and Dharmaratha, being a *Yuvarāja* (heir-apparent), assumed the title of *Mahākumārādhirāja*. It was the Kosala portion of the empire which was styled *Paścima-Kaliṅga*. It is probably synonymous with *Trikaliṅga*.[16] The administrative framework and the titles like *Kumārādhirāja* and *Mahākumārādhirāja* may be compared with *Mahākumāra* in the Paramāra dynasty.[17] The exact period of the rule of *Kumāra* Someśvara in Suvarṇapura and his relationship with *Yuvarāja* Dharmarathadeva cannot be precisely determined. *Yuvarāja* Dharmaratha probably came after *Kumāra* Someśvara and governed *Paścima-Kaliṅga*, while Janamejaya II ruled over Utkala from Yayātinagara. Janamejaya II was succeeded by Purañjaya and Karṇadeva. Nothing is known about the rulers of *Paścima-Kaliṅga* during their time. Apparently, the Kosala portion which was styled *Paścima-Kaliṅga*, passed into the hands of the Telugu-Coḍas sometime after the rule of *Yuvarāja* Dharmarathadeva. The Telugu-Coḍa ruler Someśvara II, the grandson of Yaśorāja, issued his Patna Museum[18] and Kumari-siṁhā plates[19] from Suvarṇapura. The Utkala portion too was occupied by Anantavarman Coḍagaṅgadeva in the early years of the 12th century A.D. and thus the Somavaṁśi dynasty was supplanted by the dynasty of the Gaṅgas.

---

*[It is difficult to understand the significance and correctness of the names. It is equally difficult to think that one is a mistake for the other. —Ed.]

16 N. K. Sahu (*History of Orissa*, Vol. I, pp. 97-99), on the authority of the copper plates of Vajrahasta V and Coḍagaṅgadeva, suggests that *Trikaliṅga* was situated to the west of Kaliṅga. [Kaliṅga was the coastal region of Orissa and Andhra Pradesh so that South Kosala did not lie to its west. Cf. also the expression *Veṅgī-deśaṁ Trikaliṅga-sahitam* or *Trikaliṅgāṭavī-yuktam* in Eastern Cālukya records.—Ed.]

17 D. C. Ganguly, *History of the Paramāra Dynasty*, Dacca, 1933, pp. 175-87.

18 *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. XIX, pp. 97ff.

19 *JKHRS*, Vol. I, No. 3, pp. 229ff.

XII

DIVINE KINGSHIP IN ANCIENT CAMBODIA : A STUDY OF THE PRAŚASTIS*

Adhir Kumar Chakravarti, Govt. Sanskrit College, Calcutta

There is a tendency among Indianists to depict the political life of Cambodia before the immigration of the Indians as one of complete anarchy as it is still the case among the mountain peoples of the country.[1] Coedes elucidates this view by stating that, though the Pnong, Samre or the Nux Mois of Vietnam belong to the same anthropological stock as the Cambodians, these could not evolve out of the stage of a small tribal community headed by a chief. The m st primitive Cambodians, on the other hand, are deeply influenced by the notion of a territorial and hierarchized State at the helm of which there is a king.[2] This idea of State the Cambodians may be supposed to have received from the Indians. But on the basis of the evidence contained in old Chinese texts this view has to be abandoned.[3] Indeed, it may be stated that both literary and epigraphic sources attest to the existence of chiefs holding sway over a certain territory which formed part of what later came to be known as Cambodia. Thus, according to the report of Kang T'ai and Thou Ying (c. 240 A.D.),[4] the queen of the country of Lieou-ye ('the leaves of cocoanut trees')[5] was defeated by Hiuen-t'ien (Kauṇḍinya, the name of

*[The revised copy of the paper was received on 18.9.71.—Ed.]

1 Cf. G. Masperi, in *Un empire colonial francais : l'Indochine*, Vol. I (Hanoi, 1931), pp. 233.

2 *Les états hindouisés d'Indochine et d'Indonesie* (Paris, 1964), p. 3.

3 The statement is subject to limitation. We are not competent to judge the correctness or otherwise of the French renderings of such texts chiefly by P. Pelliot and R. Stein.

4 The original report is lost ; but stray fragments of it have been quoted in different Chinese annals and encyclopaedias. See P. Pelliot, in *Etudes Asiatiques*, Vol. II (Paris, 1925), pp. 246-49.

5 R. Stein suggests that the Chinese character used should better be taken to signify willow-leaves (*Bulletin du Centre d'Etude sinologique de l' Université de Pékin—Han-hiue*, Vol. II (1947), p. 258).

a *gotra*), the first Indian immigrant to the country. Hiuen-t'ien, we are told, married the queen and thus started the first dynasty of rulers of Fou-nan, the earliest kingdom of Cambodia to be mentioned by the Chinese. In the story, one will not fail to note that Kauṇḍinya had to encounter the opposition of a woman who was the chief, not of a blood-kin group, but of a country which proves the existence of territorial monarchy in Cambodia in Pre-Indian times. The story contained in the Kang T'ai report is corroborated by a Mi-son inscription of 658 A.D.[6] It mentions Nāgī Somā as the daughter of the Nāga king, but does not tell us precisely whether the king of the Nāgas was simply a tribal chief with no fixed territory associated with him. Folklore regarding the early history of the country, however, mentions territorial states in pre-Indian times, i.e. before Prah Thoṅ, son of Ādityavaṁśa of Indraprastha, had come to the country of Kok Thlok. According to the story, Prah Thoṅ defeated the king of the country and made himself king. It then relates how he was enamoured of the Nāgī who subsequently took him to the nether world where her father, the Nāgarāja, ruled. He gave her daughter in marriage with Prah Thoṅ, extended his domains and built him a magnificent capital. Evidently, these stories were all invented after the settlement of the Indians, and as such, patterned after their political thinking. Nevertheless, it is quite possible that the indigenous people were familar with the idea of territorial monarchy.[7]

If the concept of territorial monarchy was not an Indian contribution to Cambodia, it is interesting to know precisely in what way India influenced Cambodian monarchy. It is the general opinion of Indianists that, when the veil of obscurity is lifted, one finds in Cambodia, as in other Indianized states

---

6 Finot, *Notes d'Epigraphie*, pp. 131-32. Cf. also Coedes, *Inscriptions du Cambodge (IC)*, Vol. IV, p. 90.

7 Cf. Finot, in *Melanges d'Indianisme* (offerts par ses eleves a Sylvain Lévi), Paris, 1911, p. 205 ; Mme Eve Porée-Maspéro, in *Journ. As.*, Vol. 238

of South-East Asia, a monarchy of the Indian type.[8] K. A. Nilakanta Sastri believes that, in these kingdoms, Śiva played the role of the guardian deity.[9] Coedes goes a little further in asserting that the political system was deeply imbued with the Śaiva concept of monarchy.[10] He recognizes the amalgamation of a native deity of the soil residing in a high place with the Indian god of the mountain Giriśa (Śiva). He opines that in many cases when an Indian or Indianized chief founded a new kingdom of the Indian type by bringing together the different local groups each possessing its tutelary deity or god of the soil, it is followed by the installation of an Indian divinity on the sumit of a mountain, either natural or artificial. This god was regarded as the national deity and the king was intimately connected with him.[11] In fact, there existed in Fou-nan such a holy mountain. *The History of the Southern T'sis*[12] informs us that it was the custom of the country to make offerings to the god Maheśvara. The god descends continuously on Mount Mo-tan (possibly identical with Ba-Phnom). With regard to Tchen-la or Kambuja, the successor State to Fou-nan, it is not otherwise. Liṅgaparvata (Ling-kia-po-po of the Chinese and identified with the Vat Phu mountian)[13] was its sacred mountain.

(1950), pp. 237-67, 884ff.; R. C. Majumdar, *Hindu Colonies in the Far East* (Calcutta, 1963), p. 15.

[The references may be to tribal leadership over the land occupied by a tribe for the time being.—Ed.]

8 F. D. K. Bosch, in *Tijdschrift voor Indische Taal-, Land-, en Volkenkunde*, Vol. 64 (1924), pp. 227-86; Hein-Geldern, *Far Eastern Quarterly*, Vol. 64 (1942), pp. 15-30; G. Coedes, *Les états*, etc., p. 38; D. G. E. Hall, *A History of South-East Asia* (London, 1958), p. 503.

9 *Tijdschrift*, etc., Vol. 76 (1936), p. 503.

10 Coedes, *Les états*, etc., p. 53. It may, however, be pointed out that a conception of monarchy which may be called specifically Śaiva is not known from any early Indian text or epigraph.

11 Cf. Coedes, *Les peuples de la peninsule indochinoise* (Paris, 1962), p. 57; *The Making of South-East Asia* (London, 1966), p. 54.

12 P. Pelliot has quoted the Chinese text in *BEFEO*, Vol. II (1902), p. 260.

13 Coedes, *Les états*, etc., pp. 126-27, where the text from Ma-touan-lin has been cited.

It may be noted that neither K. A. Nilakanta Sastri nor Coedes clearly indicates that the person of the king was already deified. All that they tell us is that Śiva or the god of the mountain was the guardian deity of the country and the king was intimately connected with him. In this connexion the titles borne by the rulers of Fou-nan, viz. *Parvatabhūpāla, Śaila-rāja, Kuruṅ Bnaṁ*, etc.,[14] are worth considering. If *parvata, śaila* or *bnaṁ* in these expressions be taken to mean primarily the habitat of the god on the holy mountain, its lord (*bhūpāla, rāja, kuruṅ*), the earthly king, has to be assimilated with the great god. Indeed, it seems likely that only secondarily the term for mountain came to be applied to denote the country. Thus, the name Fou-nan is derived from B'iu-nām, the Mandarinal Chinese transcription for *bnaṁ* (mod. *phnoṁ*, 'mountain').[15] It is, however, much more simple to understand the titles of the Fou-nanese rulers strictly in a secular sense. These would then mean 'lord of a mountainous country'. Keeping in view the physical configuration of the Khmer country, this is all the more likely. It may thus be concluded that, so far as the rulers of Fou-nan are concerned, no definite statement can be made as to their divine character.

For the ensuing Tchen-la or pre-Angkorian period of Cambodian history, our sources of information, both epigraphic and literary, are rather scanty. This is a fact which has to be kept in view to arrive at any conclusion regarding kingship of the period. A general observation, however, may be made here for the sake of methodological clarity: With the progress of Indianization which resulted from successive waves of culture-contact with Gupta and post-Gupta India, Indian political ideas and ideals came to permeate the political thinking of Cambodia. We shall therefore endeavour to study the question of the divinity of kings in ancient Cambodia as may be gleaned from epigraphy and compare them with the corres-

14 Barth et Bergaigne, *Inscriptions sanskrites de Champa et du Cambodge (ISCC)*, No. 1, verse 10 *(parvvata-bhūpālān)*; L. Finot, *op. cit.*, p. 203.

15 Coedes, *Les états*, etc., p. 74.

ponding Indian positions as reflected in literature and inscriptions.[16]

During the Tchen-la period, inscriptions mention kings as bearing resemblance with gods. We do not, however, countenance here reference to the physical beauty of kings excelling that of Kāma or to royal grace surpassing that of the moon.[17] Such hyperbole became too conventional to be taken seriously.[18] But this cannot be said when an inscription of Īśānavarman I describes king Rudravarman (undoubtedly identical with Rudravarman, the last ruler of Fou-nan) as possessing the prowess of the god who took three strides (*trivikrama-vikrama*).[19] In the same way, Īśānvarman I himself is said to have equalled Viṣṇu.[20] Such comparisons do not necessarily betray the acquaintance of the Khmer authors with the Indian theory of the identity of the mortal king with Viṣṇu.[21] This view appears to be corroborated by other

16 The question of the divinity of kings in ancient India has been widely discussed. See B. K. Sarkar, *Political Institutions and Theories of the Hindus* (Leipzig, 1922), pp. 179-80 : A. K. Sen, *Studies in Hindu Political Thought* (Calcutta, 1926), p. 57 ; W. Hopkins, *JAOS*, Vol. 51 (1931), pp. 309-16 ; K. V. Rangaswami Aiyangar *Aspects of the Social and Political System of Manusmṛti* (Lucknow, 1949), p. 175 ; P. V. Kane, *History of Dharmaśāstra* (Poona), Vol. III, pp. 23-24 ; A. S. Altekar, *State and Government in Ancient India* (Banaras, 1955), pp. 86-87 ; Ch. Dekmeier, *Kingship and Community in Early India* (Stanford, 1962), pp. 250-52 ; J. Gonda, *Aspects of Early Viṣṇuism* (Utrecht, 1954), pp. 164-65 ; *Numen*, Vol. IV (1957), pp. 36-37 ; *Studies in the History of Religions* (Suppl. to *op. cit.*, Leiden, 1957, pp. 177-78 ; U. N. Ghoshal, *A History of Hindu Political Theories* (Oxford, 1959) ; L. and R. Rocher, in *Annales du Centre d'Etudes des Religions* (Bruxelles, 1962), pp. 123-37 ; R. Lingat, *Les sources du droit dans le systeme traditionnel de l'Inde* (Paris, 1967), p. 232 and note 4.

17 E.g. *IC*, Vol. II, verse 2.

18 Cf. the scornful observation of Finot in *Bulletin de la Commission archéologique d'Indochine*, 1912, pp. 186-87.

19 *ISCC*, p. 66. No. 11, verse 2.

20 *IC*, Vol. IV, pp. 17-18.

21 It is stated that by making three strides the sacrificer-king becomes identified with Viṣṇu and wins the three worlds (*Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa*, 1. 7. 44). A formal enunciation of the identity of the king with Viṣṇu is made

references. In the first place, the eight-armed Viṣṇu image from Phnoṁ-Da is identified by P. Dupont with Harikambujendra mentioned in a somewhat later inscription found at the same place.[22] With regard to the significance of the name Harikambujendra, K. Bhattacharya writes : "In fact, the term *Kambujendra*, applied to Viṣṇu (Hari), clearly shows that this god was believed to be the 'Lord of the Kambujas (inhabitants of Kambujadeśa = Cambodia)' or, what amounts to the same thing, that the king of the Kambujas was identified with Viṣṇu. This supposition is wholly borne out by what we know of Divine Kingship in India and Cambodia."[23] While we have no difficulty in admitting that it was Hari who was conceived as the lord (Indra) of Kambuja, we are at pains to point out that it does not necessarily follow from the above that all kings of Kambuja were identical with Hari. Indeed *Harikambujendra* may as well signify the lord (Indra) of that part of Kambuja which was filled with water (*hari*). In this sense the eight-armed Hari will have to be regarded as the guardian deity of only one part of the Kambuja country.[24] According to this interpretation, the king is not deified. The expression may be taken as an early example of a hybrid Sanskrit-Khmer compound-form. It can then mean either 'Hari of the lord of Kambuja' (*Hari ta Kambujendra*) or 'Hari of Kambuja who is Indra' (*Harikambuja ta Indra*). The divinity of the earthly king, however, cannot be derived.

Again, a stone inscription from Saṁroṅ, which is considered pre-Angkorian on palaeographic grounds, mentions one Rājyasthalasvāmin.[25] Coedes is not sure whether it signifies

in an anonymous Smṛti text quoted by the commentator Dhuṇḍhirāja on the concluding verse of Viśākhadatta's *Mudrārākṣasa* (V. 19). See also *Viṣṇu Purāṇa*, 57.72 [sic—Ed.].

22 *La statuaire pre-angkorienne* (Ascona, 1955), p. 28.

23 *Artibus Asiae*, Vol. XXVII (1964), pp. 72-73.

24 It is tempting to suggest that Harikambuja of the inscription was identical with 'Tchen-la of the Water' of the Chinese (cf. P. Pelliot, in *BEFEO*, Vol. IV, p. 211 where the relevant text from the *History of the T'ang* is quoted).

25 *IC*, Vol. II, p. 25.

an individual or is the title of a dignitary. He also cannot throw any light on the purpose served by the stone on which the inscription is engraved.[26] But on analogy of Śrī-Śālagrāmasvāmin engraved on the Snay Pol inscription,[27] it is possible to suggest that the block of stone was nothing else than another Śālagrāma-śilā. It may thus be stated that Viṣṇu was venerated as the lord of the territory of the kingdom. Here we have a Viṣṇuite adaption of the pre-Indian soil-god. The mortal king may therefore be regarded as best as his protege and, as such, inferior to him. The subordinate position of the king *vis-a-vis* Viṣṇu is revealed also by another inscription which records the foundation, by king Puṣkara of Śambhupura, of an image of Puṣkareśa, i.e. lord of Puṣkara (Viṣṇu).[28]

The Kambuja king Jayavarman I claims to have been an incarnation of Indra.[29] The kings of Tchen-la=Kambuja are compared also with Indra.[30] One king is even said to have surpassed Indra in valour.[31] But such isolated references cannot be taken as conclusive proof of the acceptance, during the period, of the Indian view which identifies the earthly ruler with Indra.[32] These passages rather seem to indicate the

26 *Loc. cit.*

27 *Ibid.*, p. 52.

28 *BEFEO*, Vol. IV, p. 675. It is improbable that Puṣkarākṣa of the inscription of Śambhuvarmadeva (*BEFEO*, Vol. XXXVI, p. 4) refers to king Puṣkara of Śambhupura. But in case the identity is admitted, we shall have here an example of posthumous deification of the king and his identification with Viṣṇu in pre-Aṅkorian times.

29 *ISCC*, p. 62.

30 *Ibid.*, p. 40.

31 *IC*, Vol. IV, p. 7.

32 Ghoshal (*op. cit.*, p. 20) has noted that the prayer in *ṚV*, III. 38.4, is addressed to Indra, but that the same in *AV*, IV. 8.3, is offered to the worldly ruler. It is thus logical to surmise that the mortal king in the *AV* in assimilated with Indra. *ṚV*, IV. 42.8-9, however, clearly recognizes Trasadasyu as identical with Indra. The *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* repeats the formula thrice (3.5.27, 4.3.4, and 4.3.7) that the king is Indra by virtue of being a Kṣatriya and a sacrificer of *rājasūya*. Later Nārada (*Prakīrṇaka*, 20) states that the king is Indra on earth. So also Kātyāyana as quoted in the *Kṛtyakalpataru*, III. 16. In the *Rāmāyaṇa* (III. 6.19-21G.=4.17-21NW

belief that kings resembled Indra by the exercise of similar functions.[33] That the Cambodian kings of pre-Aṅkorian days considered themselves not as manifestations of, but as specially favoured by Indra, is evident from the *nom d'apotheose* Śrīndraloka borne by the maternal great-grandfather of Jyeṣṭhāryā-Kanteṅ Kamrateṅ añ ta Cpoṅ.[34] The posthumous name conveys the idea that, after death, the king became united with Indra.

The position of the mortal king *vis-a-vis* Śiva has been given differently in different inscriptions of the period. Thus, once the king is linked with Śeṣa.[35] At least in one inscription the confusion between the reigning king and Prahasiteśvara-Śiva has been deliberate.[36] Again, Jayavarman I, who considered himself, as already seen, a manifestation of Indra, has been described as a portion of Śiva-Piṅgaleśa.[37]

The pre-Aṅkorian position with regard to the divinity of kings may be summed up as follows. The deification of kings was not unknown ; but more often emphasis was put on the similarity of the functions of the king on the one hand and of the different high gods on the other. The king was the favourite of the gods and sometimes believed that he would unite with the god of his choice after death.*

During the early Aṅkorian period also the human origin

=1.18-20S), the *ṛṣis* of Daṇḍakāraṇya, however, tells Rāma that kings are one-fourth of Indra. [Just as the king is Indra on the earth, a young man is Kāma, a young girl Lakṣmī, a learned man Bṛhaspati and the like.—Ed.]

33 This view finds corroboration in ancient Indian texts. Thus Yama (quoted in *Vasiṣṭha Dharmasūtra*, XIX. 48) states that kings occupy the seat of Indra. According to Manu, V. 93-97, the king holds the same position as Indra and Brahman. Kauṭilya, I. 13, and Bhārgava in the *Nītivākyāmṛta*, V. 1, compare the king with Indra and Yama since he is the fountainhead of justice and as such dispenses with favours and punishments to those who merit them. See *Mahābhārata*, XII. 67.

34 Inscription dated 803 A.D. in *IC*, Vol. III, p. 171.

35 *Ibid.*, p. 144.

36 *Ibid.*, Vol. IV, pp. 5-6.

37 *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 8.

*[This is *sāyujya*.—Ed.]

of kings was not lost sight of. They are compared with Pṛthu[38] and Manu.[39] It may thus be pointed out that in all the different versions of the story of the consecration of Pṛthu-Vainya,[40] it is stated that Pṛthu arose in the course of the churning of the body of Vena, a mortal. The *Mahābhārata* makes it clear that after the emergence of Pṛthu, Viṣṇu entered his body by means of his ascetic power, and that is why the king, who remains nevertheless a mortal being, is endowed with the greatness of Viṣṇu on earth *(mahattvena ca saṁyukto vaiṣṇavena naro bhuvi)*.[41] In the same way, it may be observed that Manu was the first man or father of the human race.[42] In the *Mahābhārata* (XII. 67.2-31) Manu was the nominee of Brahman to rule over men ; but it is not stated that Manu was a god. Even in a late text like the *Vāyu Purāṇa* (70.1-27), Brahman consecrated Manu Vaivasvata (son of the Sun, which means little more than a claim to belong to the solar race).

Throughout the Aṅkorian period, kings continued to be compared with different high gods like Indra, Viṣṇu, Prajāpati, Brahman, Sūrya, Soma, Kubera, Skanda and, above all, Śiva (see Appendix). At the same time, they are said to be composed of elements of different gods.[43] Such comparisons

---

38 (i) Pṛthivīndravarman, the father of Indravarman (*ISCC*, p. 365) ; (ii) Yaśovarman (*Jour. As.*, 1908, pp. 210 and 218 ; *ISCC*, p. 485) ; (iii) Rājendravarman (*Jour. As.*, 1909, pp. 234, 249).

39 (i) Jayavarman II (*BEFEO*, Vol. XIII, fasc. 6, pp. 17-26) ; (ii) Yaśovarman (*ISCC*, p. 397) ; (iii) Jayavarman V (*BEFEO*, Vol. XXXVII, p. 389).

40 *Mbh.*, XII. 59 ; *Harivaṁśa*, V. 44-56 ; *Bhāgavata Purāṇa*, IV. 13.16-23, 39 ; *Viṣṇu Purāṇa*, I. 13.11-87 ; *Vāyu Purāṇa*, 62.104-193 = *Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇa*, 68.104-193 ; *Matsya Purāṇa*, X. 3-16 ; *Bṛhaddharma Purāṇa*, III. 13.1-59 ; *Viṣṇudharmottara*, I. 108-09. These texts reveal that Pṛthu was at first thought to have been endowed with the greatness of Viṣṇu, but that he was later deified. [Read '*Harivaṁśa*, I. 5. 28ff.'—Ed.]

41 *Mbh.*, XII. 59.127ff.

42 Ghoshal, *op. cit.*, p. 226.

43 Cf. (i) Yaśovarman (*ISCC*, p. 396) ; (ii) Rājendravarman (*IC*, Vol. I, p. 163) ; (iii) Sūryavarman I (*ibid.*, I, pp. 203, 214, ; Vol. V, pp. 253 261-62) ; (iv) Sūryavarman II (*ibid.*, pp. 308-09).

with an individual god or a multiplicity of gods always recognize a distinction between the king and the god or gods concerned. The purpose of such comparisons or descriptions is to emphasize that the king by virtue of his functions resembles the high gods and the Lokapālas. They remind us of Manu, IX. 303-11, and Nārada, XVII. 26-31, where the most methodical exposition regarding the assimilation by the king of the essential functions of different elemental gods have been made.[44] What is more, contrary to isolated references in the pre-Aṅkorian epigraphy, numerous examples are now forthcoming wherein complete identity of the king with a god is established. Kings are thus said to be incarnations or earthly manifestations of Indra, Viṣṇu, Prajāpati-Brahman, or Śiva (see Appendix). The position of the king *vis-a-vis* Indra and Viṣṇu in Indian theory has already been stated.[45] With regard to the king's identification with Prajāpati Brahman, the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* (V. 2.1.11 ; 2.1-24 ; 3.4.23) explaining the significance of certain rites connected with the Vājapeya sacrifice states that, by performing these, the sacrificer-king becomes identified with Prajāpati himself or his child. Again, the *Śatapatha* (V. 4.4.5.) calls the Rājanya the visible representative *(pratyakṣatama)* of Prajāpati.[46]

For ancient Cambodia, however, the most important was the identity of the king with Śiva. Recently J. Filliozat has shown that, in ancient India, Śiva was also conceived as the king of gods.[47] This position of primacy amongst gods has been accorded to Śiva in Cambodian epigraphy as well.[48] It may thus be held that the title Parameśvara, borne posthumously by Jayavarman II, applies to Śiva as well.[49]

44 See Ganganath Jha, *Manu-Smṛti* (Calcutta, 1939), Vol. II, pp. 322-23; Narayanchandra Smrititirtha, *Nārada-Smṛti*, Calcutta, 1951, p. 62.

45 Vide notes 21 and 32.

46 Cf. also Nārada (*Prakīrṇaka*, 22).

47 *Indica*, Vol. III, No. 2, pp. 101-02. [To a Śaiva, Śiva was the best god and the lord of gods.—Ed.]

48 Cf. K. Bhattacharya, *Les religions brahmaniques dans l'ancien Cambodge* (Paris, 1961), pp. 57ff. ; S. Sahai, unpublished thesis on political institutions of ancient Cambodia.

49 It may, however, be noted that in post-Gupta times the title

We may now pause a while to study the theories of the divinity of kings. In India during the Vedic period, there was no consistent theory of divine kingship. Indeed, there are passages where the human origin of the sacrificer-king is emphasized.[50] The first theoretical statement on the subject is contained in Manu, VII. 3-8,[51] according to which to put an end to anarchy the Lord (Brahman) created the king by taking portions from Indra, Wind, Yama, Sun, Fire, Varuṇa, Moon and Kubera. Shorter enumerations of gods by taking parti-

---

Paramēśvara tended more and more to supplant that of *Paramadaivata*. [This is wrong. The imperial title *Parameśvara* had nothing to do with the religious epithet *Paramadaivata*.—Ed.] The full imperial style now consisted of *Mahārājādhirāja Parameśvara Paramabhaṭṭāraka*. Even Viṣṇuvardhana-Yaśovarman of West Malwa assumed it. [Sic—Ed.] Though Pulakeśin II does not call himself *Parameśvara* [but see his Hyderabad plates.—Ed.], later inscriptions of his family do not deprive him of it. It was in fact an integral part of the name of the Cālukya rulers of Bādāmi. [This is not strictly correct.—Ed.] The Samangad and other inscriptions of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas continue the title as part of the royal style. The Western Gaṅga ruler Muttarasa also bore the title. Sircar does not see in it any allusion to deification of kings and considers it just an imperial title (*The Classical Age*, ed. Majumdar, p. 240). There are certain indications in favour of his contention. First, the Vakkaleri grant of Kīrtivarman II (*Ep. Ind.*, Vol. V, p. 202 ; IX, p. 202) informs us that Pulakeśin II received the title *Parameśvara* after defeating Harṣa, the lord of the whole of Uttarāpatha (*sakal-Ottarāpath-eśvara- śrī-Harṣavardhana-parājay-opātta-parmeśvara-śabdaḥ*). Secondly, Rāṣṭrakūṭa Dantidurga also is said to have assumed the title after defeating the Vallabha, i.e. Cālukya king (*yo vallabhaṁ sapadi daṇḍa-balena jitvā rājādhirājaparmeśvaratām—avāpa*). Thirdly, though Pulakeśin II has been called Parameśvara, he was at the same time a *Paramabhāgavata* (Lohner grant). As regards the first two points, it may be said that they do not disprove a semantic identity of Śiva and the earthly king, both being Supreme lord. With regard to the third point, it will be seen that the Cālukya and Rāṣṭrakūṭa kings even pretended to be visual representations of Śiva and Viṣṇu at the same time.

50 *Cf. Vāj. Saṁ.*, IX. 40 ; *Mait. Saṁ.*, II. 6. 6 ; *Taitt. Saṁ.*, I. 8.10, 12 ; *Kāṭh. Saṁ.*, XV. 7 ; *Taitt. Br.*, I. 7.6. ; etc.

51 For similar statements ; cf. Śukra, I. 71-72 ; Bṛhat-Parāśara quoted in the *Rājanītiprakāśa*, p. 16, and reproduced in Kane, *Hist. Dharm.*, Vol. III ; *Rām.*, II. 122.17ff.

cles of whom the king is made are also available. Thus the king is taken to be the parts of Agni, Indra, Soma, Yama and Kubera or Varuṇa.[52] It is against this background that we propose to review the development of divine kingship in Cambodia during the Aṅkor period.

The earliest attempt at theorization on the subject may be seen in the following verse contained in the inscriptions of Prah Ko[53] and Bakon[54] :

yen=ābhiṣikto vidhinā Mahendras=
Svayambhuv=āropita-devarājyaḥ/
ten=ābhiṣeka[ṁ] guṇavān=anekaṁ
yaś=śr-Indravarmm=āpad=avāryya-vīryyaḥ//

In this verse the king Indravarman is said to have been consecrated by the same rite by which Indra received the kingdom of gods from the hands of Svayambhū (i.e. Brahman). One will not fail to notice here an allusion to the great consecration ceremony of Indra *(Aindramahābhiṣeka)* by Prajāpati and other gods as described in the *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*, VIII. 12-14. According to the *Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa*, II. 2.10.4, also, it was Prajāpati who created Indra to become the king of gods. It thus appears that king Indravarman and his territory have been compared, nay one may say, assimilated, with Indra, the king of gods, and the kingdom of gods respectively. It is, however, difficult to see in the verse even a camouflaged reference to the Mahendra mountain on the summit of which, the inscription of Sdok Kak Thom[55] tells us, king Jayavarman II instituted

52 Viśvarūpa in his commentary on Yāj., I. 350, mentions the same gods as does Manu VII. 3-8, but omits Fire and Earth [sic—Ed.]. According to Ghoshal, the source of Viśvarūpa is a lost *Brāhmaṇa* text. See also *Mbh.*, XII. 68.41-47; *Rām.*, II. 122.26 (G), III. 45.12-13 (G)=43.12-13 (NW)=40.12-14(S), substitutes Varuṇa for Kubera. The same also in Bhṛgu (quoted in the *Nītivākyāmṛta*, V. 67). *Bṛhad. P.*, III. 3.6-9, mentions Janārdana instead. According to the *Mārk. P.*, 27.21-25, the king is composed of portions of Indra, the Sun, Yama, Moon and the Wind.

53 *IC*, Vol. I, p. 20 ; cf. also table at p. 17, note 1.

54 *ISCC*, No. XXXVII, verse 6.

55 *BEFEO*, Vol. XLIII, p. 87.

the cult of the Devarāja. However, the stanza quoted above establishes at best a quasi-divine theory of kingship for the early Aṅkor period. A more pronounced bias towards deification of kings can be seen in the inscriptions of Yaśovarman and Rājendravarman. It has been noted above that Indravarman and Yaśovarman have been described as *Mahendr-Opendra-vikrama*,[56] i.e. endowed with the powers of Mahendra (Indra) and Upendra (Kṛṣṇa-Viṣṇu). The Pre Rup inscription of Rājendravarman unequivocally states that the king received consecration from Mahendra, thereby identifying him with Kṛṣṇa-Viṣṇu (*Mahendrato labdha-mahābhiṣekaṁ rarāja Śaurer=iva yasya bālyam*). It is hardly necessary to point out that the reference is to the *Govind-ābhiṣeka* by Indra subsequent to the *Govardhanadhāraṇa* by Kṛṣṇa.[57] It is worthy of note that, in theory, the king still remains an incarnation of Viṣṇu, and not the high God. A theory of full-fledged divinity of kings is soon to follow. Thus, in the Kapilapura inscription of Jayavarman V, it is stated that, in the Kali age, the world became filled with blemishes and, consequently, sin, the mother of adversity, increased. To put an end to the sordid state of things, Brahman caused Śiva and Viṣṇu to descend on the earth in the form of king :

prāpte Kalau kila kalaṅka-kalā-kalāpa-
liḍhaṁ=jagad=duritakāri-vipad=vivṛddhā/
tad-bhañjanāt Kajabhavo bhuvi rājabhūyaṁ
svas=sm=āvatārayati Dhūrjaṭi-Paṅkajākṣau//[58]

It is in consonance with this theory that many Cambodian kings, both before and after Jayavarman V, have been described as Śiva and Viṣṇu at the same time.[59] It is important to note that a similar theoretical exposition of the divinity of kings is not to be found either in Indian literature or in epigraphy. But nevertheless, the theory cannot be regarded as a Khmer in-

56 *IC*, Vol. IV, p. 78 ; Vol. III, pp. 200-01.

57 *Hariv.*, 75-76 (Calcutta ed., 74-75). [II.19.—Ed.]

58 *BEFEO*, Vol. XXV, p. 366.

59 (i) Rājendravarman (*IC*, Vol. I, pp. 95, 97) ; (ii) Jayavarman V (*loc. cit.*) ; Sūryavarman I (*ibid.*, p. 199).

novation, since its contents are pretty well known to Indian inscriptions found on the other side of the Vindhyas.[60]

When the Aṅkorian civilization was at its zenith during the reign of Jayavarman VII (1183–1220 A.D.), another view of the divine origin of kings seems to have gained currency. But it must be pointed out that as yet no formal statement of it has been forthcoming. According to it, the king is simultaneously the manifestation of Brahman, Viṣṇu and Maheśvara-Śaṅkara, i.e. the Brāhmaṇical Trinity.[61] Strangely enough, a corroboration of the same is forthcoming from a Mainamati copper-plate inscription of the Candra king Laḍhahacandra. The text reads as follows :

viśv-opakārasya paro vidhātā
dharmyāt pathaś=c=ācyuta eva jātyā/
maheśvaraś=c=ājananād=ato=bhūd=
devatray-ātm=eva sa ca candravaṅgaḥ//[62]

The *Nītivākyāmṛtam* (XXIX. 16–19) offers an identical view. The *Viṣṇudharmottara* (II. 71–72 and II. 2.9) states that the king is the quintessence of all gods.

We are thus obliged to concede that there was little or nothing original in the Cambodian conception of either the similarity of functions of kings and gods, or of their complete

---

60 Cf. Aihole inscription, verse 4 : *Pṛthivivallabha-śabdo yeṣām=anvarthatāṁ ciraṁ jātaḥ.* Pulakeśin I, son of Raṇarāga, is called *Śrīvallabha* (*Ind. Ant.*, Vol. I, p. 67). The Talamanchi inscription of Cālukya Vikramādity-Satyāśraya mentions the king as *Śrī-Pṛthivīvallabha*, i.e. favourite of Fortune and of the Earth (*Ep. Ind.*, Vol. X, p. 100). The Rāṣṭrakūṭa king Dantidurga is called *Pṛthivīvallabha Mahārājādhirāja Parameśvara Paramabhaṭṭāraka* (Samangad inscription, *Ind. Ant.*, Vol. IX, p. 111).

61 *IC*, Vol. I, p. 236 :
bhūto bhūtigaṇaṁ bhṛśaṁ vibhutamo hom-ārccitaś=Śaṅkaraś=
śreyo gotravaro mahān asama-sad-dṛṣṭir=Bhavo jātavān/
kurvvan vipramadaṁ samasta-vibudhe nirvvāṇadāyy=Acyutaḥ
padmarddhiś=caturānano Vidhir=ayan=devatray-ātmā sphuṭam//

62 *Pakistan Archaeology*, No. 3 (Karachi, 1966), pp. 22-55. I am indebted to Prof. D. C. Sircar for drawing my attention to this passage. It may be noted that he reads *candra-vaṁśaḥ* (*vaṁśaḥ*) for *candra-vaṅgaḥ* found in the published text of the record.

identity. These ideas, as we have seen, were borrowed from the Indians. In two important respects, however, Cambodians showed their originality. In the first place, while in ancient India the general predilection of the theorists was to consider the functions rather than the person of the king as divine,[63] in Cambodia, it was the person of the king which in the course of time assumed greater importance. Independently of the *praśastis*, this can be corroborated by the way references are made in different inscriptions to what is called the cult of Devarāja. It has been seen earlier that the expressions *Mahendra* and *Devarājya* occur in the Prah Ko and Bakon inscriptions. These are sometimes taken to be veiled references to the installation of the Devarāja on Mount Mahendra It may be pointed out here that *devarājya* may also mean the god who is the kingdom. Moreover, following the rules of Khmer compound, the term may signify either the god of the kingdom or the god who is the kingdom. This possibility brings us to consider two series of similar expressions to be found in epigraphy till the advent of Sūryavarman I (1002–50 A.D.), e.g. (i) *Vraḥ Kamrateṅ Añ Jagat ta Rājya*, (ii) *Vraḥ Kamrateṅ Añ ta Rājya* and (iii) *Vraḥ Kamrateṅ Jagat ta Rājya*.[64] These may indicate either (i) the high god (literally, the lord of the universe) of the kingdom or (ii) the lord of the universe who is identical with the kingdom. It may therefore be held that the expression *devarājya* of the Prah Ko and Bakon inscriptions is very likely a case of Sanskritization of the Khmer phrases cited above. In any case, following the first interpretation, the *V. K. A. ta Rājya*, etc., will be identical with Rājyasthalasvāmin or guardian deity of the kingdom of pre-Áṅkorian days. The second interpretation entails the recognition of an abstract divinity of royalty, though its precise character remains incomprehensible.

63 Cf. R. Lingat, *op. cit.*, p. 232.

64 These occur mostly in the inscriptions from Chok Gargyar (Koh Ker). See *IC*, Vol. I, pp. 47-71 (particularly K. 186, 187, door-jamb South, 188, 189 682). *V. K. A. ta Rājya* occurs also in the inscription of Kok Rosei (*IC*, Vol VI, p 175) while the Prasat Khna inscription of 980 A. D. calls the divinity *K A. ta Rājya* (*BEFEO*, Vol. XLIII, p. 10).

From the foregoing analysis, one will not fail to observe that it is in the second interpretation only that *devarājya* taken as a Sanskrit compound corresponds with the Khmer expression *V. K. A. Jagat ta Rājya*, etc., and in this sense, the sovereign authority of the State was, not the king, but an abstract godhead.[65]

From the time of Sūryavarman I inscriptions no longer mention the series *devarājya-V. K. A. ta Rājya*, etc. A new series now appears, viz. *Devarājya-V.K.A. ta Rāja.*[66] The term *devarāja* may mean either (i) the king of gods or (ii) the god who is the king. The Khmer expression *V. K. A. ta Rāja* signifies either (i) the god (i.e. lord) of kings or (ii) the lord who is the king. It thus appears that the second interpretation in each case is identical and as such *devarāja–V. K. A. ta Rāja* should be understood only in this latter sense. One may therefore admit that, from the reign of Sūryavarman I onward, deification of the royal person provides the *raison d'etre* of their authority.

An intermediate stage in the deification of the king's person was reached during the reign of Rājendravarman (944–68 A. D.). His Pre Rup inscription mentions the erection of two *liṅgas*. The first called Rājendrabhadreśvara is said to have been the principal one (*liṅgam=atr=aidam=agryam*) whereas the other named Rājendravarmeśvara allegedly contained the essence of the king *(bhūpālabhāva)*.[67] Rājendravarmeśvara may thus be regarded as the personal *liṅga* of the king. It is worthy of note that the personal *liṅga* was subordinate to Rājendrabhadreśvara taken to be the visual representation of the Devarāja (or rather of the *V. K. A. ta Rājya*) for the reign.[68] There was also another earlier sanctuary of the deity under the vocable Rājendreśvara at Mebon,[69] where significantly the

65 A more detailed discussion on the point will be made by us elsewhere in connection with the Sdok Kak Thom inscription.

66 *BEEEO*, Vol. XLIII, pp. 79, 87 ; Vol. XXVIII, p. 142.

67 *IC*, Vol. I, p. 102.

68 P. Stern, in *BEFEO*, Vol. XLIV, fasc. 2, p. 678.

69 *Ibid.*, Vol. XXV, p. 331. From what has been said in the text, it

liṅga enshrining the personal essence of the king is absent.

Another development which took place in Cambodia with regard to the deification of kings is the tendency on the part of the authors of *praśastis* to depict the king as superior to gods, both in their individual and collective capacity. It has already been noted that the tendency was latent even in pre-Aṅkorian days ; but in later times it came to the surface and set the tone of the *praśastis* (see Appendix).

Undoubtedly, the pretension of the kings as identical with or superior to gods must have its repurcussions on the political life of the country. It can be safely inferred that the king in ancient Cambodia could pose himself theoretically as a far greater despot than it was possible for his Indian counterpart to pretend. Things could actually be so, had not there taken place a simultaneous, or even concomittant, development to mitigate or neutralize royal despotism. If the Cambodian kings were deified, so were many of their subjects. It is not a question of posthumous deification, since in that case it could have been dismissed simply as another evidence of ancestor-worship. There is indeed proof to show that, if not all the members of lay aristocracy, at least the relatives of the kings were deified even in their life-time. Thus, according to the Prasat Car inscription,[70] Jayavarman V ordered some of his officers to hand over certain pieces of land situated along the river to Kaṁsteṅ Śri-Rājapativarman and others for the purpose of installing a number of gods. This Rājapativarman is known to be the brother-in-law of Jayavarman V and maternal

---

will be apparent that M. Jean Imbert is not quite justified when he says that Devarāja never signified the king in person and that the king is always presented as the most worthy and virtuous of the faithful ('Histoire des institutions khmeres', *Annales de la Faculté de l'Université de Phnom Penh*, Vol. II, Phnom Penh, 1961, p. 24). His contention that no Khmer inscription mentions a king bearing the name of the high god is also unfounded since we know that Jayavarman II, with whom started the Aṅkorian monarchy, bore the posthumous name Parameśvara, i.e. Śiva.

70 Southern door-jamb inscription, dated 979 A. D., *IC*, Vol. IV, pp. 142-43.

uncle of king Udayādityavarman I.[71] What is important is that, according to the Prasat Car inscription, one of the idols erected was called V.K.A. Parameśvara which was the personal image *(rūpa)* of Kaṁsteṅ Śrī-Rājapativarman (lines 7–8). There is no reason to suppose that, at the time of the installation of the gods, Rājapativarman was no longer alive. As a matter of fact, the inscription of Prasat Kantop, which is slightly later, informs us that during the reign of Sūryavarman I he was still living.[72] What is more, he now bore the exalted title of *Vraḥ Kamrateṅ Añ* which Coedes has shown to be the Khmer equivalent for Sanskrit *deva*.[73] It may thus be taken for granted that Rājapativarman was deified even in his lifetime. Indeed, Khmer epigraphy of the Aṅkor period is replete with mention of officials bearing the title *Vraḥ Kamrateṅ Añ* which points to the growing tendency of deifying the bureaucracy.[74]

The case of Sadāśiva-Jayendravarman of the family of Śivakaivalya is also a pointer. He was at first called, like all the other members of his family, *Steṅ Añ* (4.43); next he was promoted to the rank of *Kaṁsteṅ* (4.45); but finally he was holding the title *Vraḥ Kamrateṅ Añ* (4.65) and, as such, was deified.[75] Yogīśvarapaṇḍita II was another priest who, in the inscription of Saṁroṅ (to be dated in the reign of Dharaṇīndravarman I) holds this title.[76] In the same way, Divākarapaṇḍita,

71 Prasat Khna, southern door-jamb, dated 1001 A. D., *BEFEO*, Vol. XI, pp. 400-04.

72 *IC*, Vol. V, p. 136.

73 *Ibid.*, Vol. IV, p. 189, note 3. That *Vraḥ Kamrateṅ Añ* was rendered into Sanskrit as *deva* may also be shown by comparing the titles of Jayendravarman in the Sdok Kak Thom inscription. He is called *deva* in verse 75 and given the title *V. K. A.* in the Khmer text (4.65).

74 The officers charged with the inquiry into the *bona fides* of land transactions as also the witnesses at the time of laying boundary stones generally bear the title of *V. K. A.* [In Sanskrit, of course the word *deva* does not mean 'a god' exclusively.—Ed.]

75 Sdok Kak Thom inscription, *BEFEO*, Vol. XV, pp. 83, 91.

76 *IC*, Vol. IV, p. 186.

the chaplain of Sūryavarman II, also enjoyed it.[77] It must not, however, be supposed that the deification of priests began only with Sūryavarman I or ended with Dharaṇīndravarman I. As a matter of fact, as early as the time of Rājendravarman, his son-in-law the Brāhmaṇa Divākarabhaṭṭa is called *Deva* or *Vraḥ Kamrateṅ Añ*.[78] Even his wife, the princess Indralakṣmī, appears to have been identified with Bhagavatī, though it is not known from the inscription whether she was deified only posthumously.[79] The latest Sanskrit inscription of Cambodia has for its author a learned Brāhmaṇa named Vidyeśadhīmat. He seems to have been endowed with divine attributes. It may be noted that some of these priests were connected with the ruling family by marriage ; but this had nothing to do with their deification, because in the case of others no such alliances were contracted. One may thus conclude that a section of the priestly community also came to be looked upon as gods even in their lifetime. What therefore seems to have been practised in Aṅkorian Cambodia was not so much the odious despotism of a king conceived of as a high god, but an ideal theocracy where the king and at least his intimate associates, both lay and ecclesiastical, were so many living gods. In every sense of the term the king became *devarāja*.

77 *BEFEO*, Vol. XLIII, pp. 141-42.

78 *IC*, Vol. I, p. 167 (A, verse 47) ; B, line 1.

79 Prasat Komphus inscription, C, lines 89 and 31-32 (*IC*, Vol. I).

APPENDIX

[The references given below are not comprehensive.]

A. *Compared with Gods*

(1) *with Indra* : (i) Jayavarman II (*IC*, V, pp. 165-66 ; *BEFEO*, Vol. XIII, fasc. 6, pp. 17-26) ; (ii) Indravarman (*IC*, Vol. I, p. 20) ; (iii) Yaśovarman (*ibid.*, Vol. III, pp. 200-01 = *ISCC*, p. 548 ; *ISCC*, pp. 367, 373) ; (iv) Jayavarman IV (*IC*, Vol. I, p. 57) ; (v) Harṣavarman II (*IC*, Vol. V, pp. 165-66) : (vi) Rājendravarman (*ibid.*, Vol. I, pp. 163-64 ; *BEFEO*, Vol. XXV, pp. 330-31);(vii) Jayavarman V (*IC*, Vol. I, pp. 149, 153 ; Vol. V, p. 166) ; (viii) Jayaviravarman (*ibid.*, Vol. II, p. 100) ; (ix) Sūryavarman I (*ibid.*, Vol. III, p. 47 ; Vol. V, pp. 252, 259, note 3) ; (x) Jayavarman VII (*ibid.*, Vol. IV, p. 239).

(2) *with Viṣṇu* : (i) Jayavarman II (*BEFEO*, Vol. XXV, p. 300 ; *IC*, Vol. VII, pp. 85, 87) ; (ii) Yaśovarman (*ISCC*, No. XLIV, pp. 371-72 ; No. LV, pp. 396, 403 ; *BEFEO*, Vol. XXXII, pp. 89, 94-95) ; (iii) Harṣavarman II (*IC*, Vol. VII, p. 21) ; (iv) Jayavarman IV (*ibid.*, Vol I, p. 261 (doubtful) ; *BEFEO*, Vol. XIII, fasc. 6, pp. 17-26) ; (v) Harṣavarman II (*BEFEO*, Vol. XXV, p. 357) ; (vi) Rājendravarman (*IC*, Vol. IV, p. 78 ; *BEFEO*, Vol. XXV, p. 323 ; *Journ. As.*, 1909, pp. 234, 339 ; *IC*, Vol. IV, pp. 90-93) ; (vii) Jayavarman V (*ibid.*, p. 165 ; *BEFEO*, Vol. XXVIII, p. 64) ; (ix) Sūryavarman I (*IC*, Vol. V, p. 224).

(3) *with incarnations, etc., of Viṣṇu* : (i) Yaśovarman (*ISCC*, No. LV, Paraśurāma) , (ii) Jayavarman I (Tuol Ta Pec, verse 17—Śauri ; verse 47—Kṛṣṇa, verses 27 and 69—Garuḍa, verse 42—Rāma) ; (iv) Jayavarman Parameśvara (*ISCC*, No. LXV, p. 515—Varāha).

(4) *with Brahman Prajāpati* : (i) Jayavarman II (*BEFEO*, Vol. XXV, p. 300) ; (ii) Yaśovarman (*ibid.*, Vol. XXXII, p. 89, 94-95 ; *IC*, Vol. II, p. 184 ; *BEFEO*, Vol. XXV, p. 306 ; *ISCC*, No. LV, p. 397).

(5) *with Sūrya* : (i) Jayavarman V (*IC*, Vol. I, p. 165) ; (ii) Sūryavarman I (*ibid.*, Vol. V, p. 259) ; (iii) Sūryavarman II (*ibid.*, pp. 308-09).

(6) *with the Moon-god* : (i) Sūryavarman I (*IC*, Vol. V, p. 259) ; (ii) Sūryavarman II (*ibid.*, pp. 308-09).

(7) *with Kubera* : Yaśovarman (*ISCC*, No. LVIII, p. 454).

(8) *with Skanda* : Sūryavarman I (*op. cit.*, p. 253).

(9) *with Dakṣa* : Rājendravarman (*IC*, Vol. IV, p. 90).

(10) *with Śiva* : (i) Yaśovarman (*IC*, Vol. II, p. 119 ; *ISCC*, No. LVIII, p. 454) ; (ii) Rājendravarman (*BEFEO*, Vol. XXV, pp. 323, 344 ; *Journ. As.*, 1909, p. 236) ; (v) Jayavarman V (*IC*, Vol. V, p. 178) ; (iv) Sūryavarman I (*ibid.*, p. 253) ; (v) Jayavarman VI (*ibid.*, Vol. VI, p. 301).

B. *Identified with Gods*

(1) *with Indra* :

(i) Yaśovarman (*BEFEO*, Vol. XXV, p. 306 ; *IC*, Vol. II, pp. 184-85) ; (ii) Sūryavarman (*ibid.*, Vol. V, p. 252).

(2) *with Viṣṇu*

(i) Yaśovarman (*Journ. As.*, 1908, pp. 209, 216 ; *ISCC*, No. LIX, p. 479 ; *ibid.*, No. LX, p. 505) ; (ii) Rājendravarman (*ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 95 ; *Journ. As.*, 1909, p. 230) ; (iii) Sūryavarman I (*IC*, Vol. V, p. 217) ; (iv) Jayavarman VII (*ibid.*, Vol. IV, p. 211).

(3) *with incarnations of Viṣṇu* : Rājendravarman : Kṛṣṇa (*Journ. As.*, 1909, p. 234) ; Narasiṁha (*ioid.*, p. 235).

(4) *with Prajāpati Brahman* : (i) Yaśovarman (*ISCC*, No. XLIV, pp. 366, 372) ; (ii) Rājendravarman (*BEFEO*, Vol. XXV, p. 326)—

sākṣāt Prajāpatir=dakṣo dakṣiṇa-kṣaṇam=akṣīṇot/
sakalaṁ sa-kalaṅkaṁ yaḥ kali-doṣ-ākaraṁ kṛtī//

Finot translates the expression *sākṣāt prajāpatir=dakṣo* as 'habile comme le Createur' (*op.cit.*, p. 346). But in our opinion it should better be rendered either as establishing the identity of the king with Prajāpati-Brahman who is efficient (the proof of his efficiency lying in diminishing the blemishes caused by the vices of Kali) or with Dakṣa Prajāpati, son of Brahman.

The latter, however, is little likely. (iii) Sūryavarman I (*IC*, Vol. V, p. 252 ; *BEFEO*, Vol. XXV, p. 377 ; *IC*, Vol. II, p. 165).

(5) *with Śiva* : [No notice is taken here of the *nom d'apotheose* Parameśvara given to Jayavarman II.] (i) Yaśovarman (*ISCC*, p. 366 ; *Journ. As.*, 1908, p. 210) ; (ii) Rājendravarman (*IC*, Vol. I, p. 83) ; (iii) Sūryavarman I (*ibid.*, p. 202 ; Vol. V, p. 256) ; (iv) Jayavarman VII (*ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 231 ; *ibid.*, Vol. IV, p. 241).

(6) *with incarnations of Śiva* : (i) Jayavarman IV (*IC*, Vol. I, p. 58)—

Kāleṣu kāleya-kalaṅka-paṅkair=
ddigdh-āṅkitān loka-gaṇāṁś=cirāya
Trilocanas=trāṇatayā vilocya
bhūmau dhruvaṁ svāṁśam=atārayad=yam//

Bhattacharya has pointed out the similarity of the stanza with the following passage occurring in a 13th century Indian inscription : *yasmin ātmakalāṁ nyadhatta sakala-kṣatr-āvataṁse jagat-tāpa-vyāpad-apākariṣṇu-mahimā śrī-Vaidyanāthaḥ prabhuḥ* ('Harikambujendra', *loc. cit.*, p. 74). (ii) Sūryavarman I (*IC*, Vol. I, p. 202)

C. Regarded as *Superior to Gods* :

(1) *to Indra* : (i) Jayavarman II (*BEFEO*, Vol. XLIII, p. 78)—*Jayavarmma-mahibhṛto mahendr-avanibhṛn-mūrddha-kṛt-āspadasya śāstā.* This passage may signify that Jayavarman II held his place on the head of Mahendra (i.e. Indra as contrasted with Upendra, i.e. Kṛṣṇa) and of the earthly kings (*avanibhṛt*). (ii) Yaśovarman, *BEFEO*, Vol. XXXII, p. 87=B, verse I of the complementary text of Prei Prasat inscription (*ISCC*, No. LVI, pp. 420-21). According to this text, the king is superior to Indra for two reasons. First, the king has performed innumerable sacrifices whereas Indra is credited with the performance of only hundred sacrifices. Secondly, while Indra is the creature of Prajāpati Brahman, the king is independent of him. (iii) Harṣavarman I (*IC*, Vol. VII, p. 21) ; (iv) Jayavīravarman (*ibid.*, Vol. V, p. 178) ; (v) Sūryavarman I (*ibid.*, p. 254) ; (vi) Jayavarman VI (*ibid.*, Vol. VI, p. 302).

(2) *to Viṣṇu* : (i) Rājendravarman (*ibid.*, Vol. I. p. 97 ; *Journ. As.*, 1909, p. 235). In these examples, the king excels Viṣṇu for two reasons ; first, the former conquers the universe with only one stride whereas it required three strides for the latter to achieve the same object, and secondly, in the interval between two aeons Viṣṇu-Anantaśāyin remains fast asleep in *yoga-nidrā* though the king remains always wide awake. (ii) Jayavarman V (*IC*, Vol. I, p. 149).

(3) *to the Sun* : Jayavarman V (*ibid.*, Vol. V, p. 178).

(4) *to Skanda* : Sūryavarman I (*ibid.*, p. 254).

(5) *to Śiva* : Jayavarman VII (*ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 234 (the king is Maheśa while Śiva is only Īśa).

(6) *to multiple gods* : (i) Yaśovarman (*ibid.*, Vol. V, p. 252 —superior to Indra, Viṣṇu lord of Ananta, and the Sun) ; (ii) Jayaviravarman (*ibid.*, p. 189 ; cf. Coedes, *ibid.*, p. 190, note 4) ; (iii) Sūryavarman I (*ibid.*, p. 254—superior to Viṣṇu, Śiva and Kṛṣṇa) ; (iv) Jayavarman VII (*ibid.*, Vol. IV, p. 210 —superior to Viṣṇu and Śiva).

SUPPLEMENT

XIII

ADMINISTRATIVE SYSTEM IN PALI LITERATURE*

Jnan Ranjan Haldar, Centre of Advanced Study in AIHC, Calcutta University

There is much information regarding administration in the three *piṭakas*, viz. *Vinaya*, *Sutta* and *Abhidhamma*, which were compiled sometime before the 2nd century B.C.[1] The *Milinda-pañha*, a non-canonical Pali work, in which the evidence of the existence of *piṭakas* and of *nikāyas* is found, belongs to the 1st century A.D. Some other works including commentaries were written at later dates.[2]

Elsewhere[3] we have said, in connection with the origin of the Khattiya caste in Pali literature, that when the world was re-evolved after its destruction by fire, a ruler was required to maintain law and order. At one stage of the re-creation of the universe, when the question of hoarding up of grains, setting up of boundaries, acquisition of private property, crime, etc., appeared, the people wanted to live in a disciplined society. According to the *Dīghanikāya*[4] and *Visuddhimagga*,[5] they selected from among themselves, a king, who would bring peace and discipline in the society by establishing the rights of people. The king was called Mahāsammata, and also Khattiya because he became *khettānaṁ pati* (lord of the fields) when he was given a share of grains for his service to the people.[6] He delighted people by his righteousness and equity. With the passage of time, this office of the king became here-

*[The paper was received on 30.3.72.—Ed.]

1 M. Winternitz, *A History of Indian Literature*, Vol. II, pp. 4-6, 15, 17-18.

2 *Ibid.*, pp. 197-205.

3 *Social Life in Ancient India*, ed. D. C. Sircar, pp. 45-46.

4 PTS, Vol. III, pp. 92-93.

5 See pp. 417-19.

6 *Dīgha.*, Vol. II, p.93. [The interpretation of *Khattiya* is fanciful.—Ed.]

ditary. But, side by side with monarchy, some non-monarchical forms of government are found in ancient India. In both the forms of government, the State was divided into different provinces or districts. The *Itivuttaka*[7] and *Vinaya Piṭaka*[8] refer to *Padesarajja* (provincial government) and *Padesarājā* (ruler of a province) respectively. The said *Piṭaka*[9] and other texts mention *Gāmika*,[10] *Gāmaṇī* and *Gāmabhojaka*[11] as the governor of a village. It may thus be assumed that a province or district was divided into villages. This suggests that there are three kinds of government in a State of ancient India, viz. (1) Central government, (2) Provincial or District government and (3) Village government.[12]

In explaining the position of a king during the period under review, it is found that there is no uniform interpretation of the term *rājā* in Buddhist literature. It is an appellative or title of a Khattiya, and often the two are used promiscuously. The Pali texts not only explain it as 'king' in the sense of an elected or a successive monarch, but also as a distinguished nobleman, or a local chieftain, or a prince with various attributes characterizing his position in respect of special functions. The term *rājā* was also used in respect of a *Cakkavattī*, the world-ruler, the three types of which were (a) *Cakkavāla-cakkavattī*, (b) *Dīpa-cakkavattī* and (c) *Padesa-cakkavattī*.

It is often stated that rulers of various administrative units

---

7 PTS, p. 15.

8 PTS, Vol. III, p. 47.

9 Vol. I, 179; Vol. II, p. 296.

10 Cf. *Anguttara.*, PTS, Vol. III, pp. 76, 78, 300.

11 *Dhammapadaṭṭhakathā*, PTS, Vol. I, p. 69; *Jātaka*, PTS, Vol. I, p. 199. [*Gāma-bhojaka* probably enjoyed a village as a *jā'gīr*.—Ed.]

12 According to the *Vinaya Piṭaka*, Vol. I, p. 179, king Bimbisāra called an assembly of 80,000 *Gāmikas* of 80,000 villages for discussing important questions on administrative policy as he had the sovereignty over the same number of villages. Thus the king called an assembly of village chiefs instead of *Padesarājās*. This suggests that the village government was next to the Central Government, and that there was not a separate Padesa government, in the dominions of Bimbisāra. [It is probably better to speak of 'administration' (not 'government') of villages.—Ed.]

or provincial administrators of a republican State were called *Rājā* or king, and that they were the members of the Central Assembly. The *Kiṇāla Jātaka*[13] also speaks of the Kumāras of the Sākiyas and Koliyas as *rājāno* of the *rājakula*.

As stated above, a subordinate king was also called *Rājā*. The *Vinaya Piṭaka*[14] mentions kings of three ranks—(1) *mahesakkhā rājāno*, (2) *majjhimā rājāno* and (3) *nīcā rājāno*.

Sometimes officials and men who represented the king and were considered by the people almost equal to the king were called *Rājā*.[15] According to the *Vinaya Piṭaka*,[16] those who had juridical power were regarded as *Rājā*.

Generally, *Rājā* is the supreme ruler(i.e. Khattiya) of a kingdom. According to the *Niddesa*,[17] the significant idea of a king prevalent in early Buddhist time is : *khattiyo muddh-ābhisitto vijita-saṅgāmo nihata-paccāmitto laddh-ādhippāyo paripuṇṇa-koṭṭhāgāro*, i.e., "crowned nobleman, victorious in battle, slaying his foes, fulfilling his desires, having his storehouses full." The *Vinaya Piṭaka*[18] and *Suttanipāta*[19] describe such a *Rājā* as *mukhaṁ manussānaṁ*, i.e. 'the top of men'.

The kings and princes were described as conventional gods (*Sammatidevā*) in the *Khuddakapāṭha Commentary*[20] which proves that the Buddhists accepted the divinity of kings. But,as there was no supreme god in the Buddhist universe,[21] the kings were not the incarnations of gods. The Buddhists showed great respect to the kings because they selected their own king who acquired some qualifications of a perfect ruler. Hence, in

13 *Jātaka*, Vol. V, p. 413 ; *Ekapaṇṇa Jātaka*, No. 149 (*ibid.*, Vol. I, pp. 504-08).

14 Vol. I, p. 228.

15 *Mahāvaṁsa*, Ch. 9 ; A. S. Altekar, *State and Government in Ancient India*, p. 185

16 Vol. III, p. 47 *(rājā padesarājā maṇḍalikā antarabhogikā akkhadassā mahāmattā ye vā pana chejjabhejjaṁ anusāsanti ete rājāno nāma)*.

17 Vol. II, p. 237.

18 Vol. I, p. 246.

19 PTS, verse 563.

20 See p. 123.

21 *Journal of Ancient Indian History*, Vol III, pp. 108-09.

their opinion (*sammati*), the kings were as great as divine beings. The kings might also be regarded as *Visuddhidevā* according to the classification of the gods mentioned in the above *Commentary*. It says that those who are Arahants and Buddhas are *Visuddhidevā*. As the *Milindapañha*[22] says that the kings should acquire four qualities of the Arahant, they were regarded as *Visuddhidevā*. However, though the kings were not the incarnations of the supreme god, they were respected and placed above human level because they acquired qualifications above those of an ordinary man.

Although the office of king became hereditary[23] in course of time, the selection of king by the consent of the whole people is found in the *Pañcagaru*[24] and *Telapatta*[25] Jātakas, in the *Petavatthu Commentary*[26] and the *Mahāvaṁsa*.[27] The *Dighanikāyu*[28] also speaks of substantial powers of the people in the selection of a king. It says that prince Reṇu requested the people to select him as a king after the death of his father Disampati. The administration of a country was carried on by a council of regency in case the heir-apparent was a minor at his succession. At the request of her subjects, the dowager queen presided[29] over this council.

Sometimes kings were corrupt, tyrannical, unrighteous and cruel according to the *Milindapañha*[30] and the *Bharu*,[31] *Cetiya*,[32] *Khantivādi*[33] and *Culladhammapāla*[34] *Jātakas*. On

22 See p. 323.

23 *Jātaka*, Vol. I, p. 395; Vol. II, p. 116; Vol. IV, p. 124. See also Fick, *The Social Organisation of North-East India*, pp. 123-31.

24 *Jātaka*, Vol. I p. 470.

25 *Ibid.*, p. 395.

26 See p. 74.

27 See Ch. II (R. C. Majumdar, *Corporate Life in Ancient India*, p. 101).

28 Vol. II, pp. 233-34.

29 *Jātaka*, Vol. IV, pp. 109, 487.

30 See pp. 50, 203.

31 *Jātaka*, Vol. II, p. 169.

32 *Ibid.*, Vol. III, p. 454.

33 *Ibid.*, p. 39.

34 *Ibid.*, p. 178.

these grounds, Richard Fick[35] says that kings were, in most cases, unrighteous and were oppressors of the people. The *Dīghanikāya*[36] says that a king should have eight qualifications—well-born ('gentleman', Khattiya), handsome, wealthy, powerful (possessing an army), a believer, learned, clever and intelligent. It is said at several places that a king should have the following ten qualities (*dasa-rājadhammā*)—giving alms, leading a moral life, sacrifice, truthfulness, mildness, self-denial forgiveness, causing no pain to anybody, patience and yielding disposition. The *Milindapañha*[37] emphasizes the king's disciplinary authority stating that he has four qualities of the Arahant.[38] It also states that the king spares no tortures in punishing adversaries or malefactors, especially the *cora*.[39] The *Dīghanikāya*[40] says that the king gives food and seed-corn to the farmer, capital to the trader, wages to the people in government service. All these qualities show that the kings were originally and generally righteous. According to the Jātakas, the responsibility[41] of a king is so great that even sugar and salt lose their flavour when the kings are unrighteous.

There is no doubt that the kings became greedy at times and also misbehaved with their subjects. But the people did not tolerate bad kings and, according to the *Milindapañha*[42] and the *Padakusalamāṇava*[43] and *Saccaṁkira*[44] *Jātakas*, they removed them from the country and selected a new king from among themselves. The *Aṅguttaranikāya*[45] says that, if a king is lazy, he is not liked by the people.

35 *Op. cit.*, pp. 101-02, 105.
36 Vol. I, p. 137.
37 See pp. 226f.
38 *Ibid.*, p. 323.
39 *Ibid.*, pp. 226f.
40 Vol. I, p. 135.
41 Any disorder in the society was regarded as due to the king's inefficiency.
42 See pp. 69, 262.
43 *Jātaka*, Vol. III, p. 501.
44 *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 326.
45 Vol. III, pp. 299-300.

However, as the king was the supreme ruler of a monarchical State, he had the political, military and juridical power by which he protected his subjects from external and internal enemies and looked after the safety of their person and property through the *Mahāmatta*, the active head of the state.

Mahāmatta, the king's chief minister, was the highest officer of the State and real head of the executive. He is often called *Rāja-mahāmatta* (royal minister). According to the *Vinaya Piṭaka*,[46] the position of a *Mahāmatta* was of such importance that he was sometimes called *Rājā* or king. The same work[47] mentions *Senānāyaka Mahāmatta*, the minister of defence and *Vohārika Mahāmatta*, the minister of law. Besides, mention of *Sabbatthaka Mahāmatta*, the executive minister, is found, in the Jātakas.[48] Thus we find that there were many *Mahāmattas* holding responsible position of a respective department of the administration under a king. There were other junior officers under the *Mahāmattas*.

According to the *Milindapañha*,[49] the ministers were exempted from taxes. They selected a suitable successor from among the relations of the deceased king in case he did not leave any proper heir.[50] Sometimes the ministers themselves exercised sovereign power.[51] The *Pādañjali Jātaka*[52] says that the chief minister was anointed king if the son of a deceased king was not eligible for governing the State. The *Mahāvaṁsa*[53] says that the ministers took over the administration in their own hands after the death of Vijaya, the king of Ceylon, but that they handed over charge to the king's nephew when he returned from India after one year.

---

46 Vol. III, p. 47.

47 Vol. I, p. 74.

48 *Jātaka*, Vol. II, p. 57 ; cf. *Milindapañha*, p. 291 ; *Sacred Books of the East*, Vol. XXXVI, p. 147, note.

49 See p. 146.

50 *Jātaka*, Vol I, p. 470 ; Vol. V, p. 187, etc.

51 *Ibid.*, Vol. II, p. 2 ; Vol. III, p. 170.

52 *Ibid.*, Vol. II, p. 264.

53 See Ch. 9 (Altekar, *op. cit.*, p. 185).

The *Milindapañha*[54] says that, among officers under the king, six were reckoned as officers of State—the Commander-in-chief, the Prime Minister, Chief Justice, High Treasurer, Bearer of Sunshade, and Sword-bearer. According to the said work,[55] ministers were appointed by the king. The *Cullavagga*[56] says that the king dismissed ministers who gave bad advice, degraded some for inefficiency and promoted others for their good services. Although the king examined the offices of ministers and the duties assigned to them,[57] the position of ministers was important in the state. The king took their advice in worldly and spiritual matters.[58] The king, as stated above,[59] convened the assembly of officers for discussing administrative policy.

As the king has to protect his people against external enemies, he has to maintain an army consisting of *hatthī* (elephant), *assā* (horse), *rathā* (chariots) and *pattī* (infantry).[60] The General was designated as *Senānāyaka*,[61] *Senāni*, *Senāpati*[62] and *Mahāsenagutta*.[63] In order to preserve internal order and to protect the people, the city was surrounded by a wall. According to the Jātakas,[64] the *Milindapañha*[65] and the *Dhammapadaṭṭhakathā*,[66] the superintendent of city police called *Nagaraguttika* maintained peace in the city.

Whilst the king protected his people, the latter bore the cost of administration of the State, the army and the court

54 See p. 114.
55 See p. 146.
56 See Fick, *op. cit.*, p. 141.
57 *Jātaka*, Vol. III, p. 239.
58 *Ibid.*, p. 342.
59 See above, p. 115, note 12.
60 *Jātaka*, Vol. IV, p. 494.
61 *Vinaya Piṭaka*, Vol I; p. 73.
62 *Ibid.*, p. 233; *Suttanipāta*, verse 556; *Aṅguttara.*, Vol. III, p. 38; Vol. IV, p. 79; *Jātaka*, Vol. I, p. 133; Vol. IV, p. 43.
63 *Jātaka*, Vol. V, p. 115. [The meaning of *Senagutta* is doubtful.—Ed.]
64 *Ibid.*, Vol. III, pp. 30, 436; Fick, *op. cit.*, p. 158.
65 See p. 345.
66 Vol. IV, p. 55.

by payment of taxes. There are statements in the Jātakas[67] showing that the king's officers collected tax forcibly if it was not paid voluntarily by the people themselves. Pali texts mention the following names of tax-collectors—*Sunika*,[68] *Suṅkasāyika*,[69] *Balisādhaka*,[70] *Balipaṭiggāhaka*[71] and *Niggāhaka*.[72] Mention of the *Doṇamāpaka Mahāmatta* is found in some Jātakas[73] and in the *Dhammapada Commentary*.[74] He supervised the measuring of the Doṇa revenue. In the *Dīghanikāya*,[75] the finance officials are designated as *Gaṇaka Mahāmatta*.

The state had a treasury which was looked after by officers called *Kosārakkha*,[76] *Bhaṇḍāgārika*,[77] and *Āyakammika*.[78] The *Commentaries* on the *Dīghanikāya*[79] and *Vibhaṅga*,[80] the *Visuddhimagga*[81] and some Jātakas[82] speak of an officer designated as *Heraññika* who performed his duties as banker or money-changer.

Besides, the Pali works mention other officers, namely,

---

67 See Vol. II, p. 240 ; Vol. IV, p. 224 ; Vol. V, p. 98.

68 *Ibid.*, Vol. V, p. 254.

69 *Milindapañha*, p. 365.

70 *Jātaka*, Vol. IV, p. 366 ; Vol. V, p. 103 ; Fick, *op. cit.*, p. 120.

71 *Jātaka*, Vol. II, p. 17.

72 *Ibid.*, Vol. IV, p. 362.

73 *Ibid* , Vol. II, pp. 367, 378.

74 Vol. IV, p. 88. The *Doṇa-māpaka*, was so called because he measured revenue with the *doṇa*, a certain dry measure (a wooden pail). [He measured corn in *droṇa* measures for determining the king's share of the grains—Ed.]

75 Vol. III, pp. 64-65.

76 *Aṅguttara* , Vol. III, pp. 57-59.

77 *Vinaya Piṭaka*, Vol. I, p. 284 ; Vol. II, p. 176 ; *Jātaka*, Vol. I, p. 293 ; Vol. IV, p. 43 ; Vol. V, p. 117 ; *Milindapañha*, p. 37 ; *Dīgha. Comm.*, Vol. I, p. 21 ; *Peta. Comm.*, pp. 2, 20 ; cf. Fick, *op cit.*, p. 101.

78 *Dhamma. Comm.*, Vol. I, p. 184.

79 Vol. I, p. 315.

80 See p. 91.

81 See p. 515.

82 Vol. I, p. 369 ; Vol. III, p. 193.

(1) *Rajjugāhaka*,[83] land surveyor; (2) *Rājadūta*,[84] king's messenger; (3) *Senāsanagāhāpaka*,[85] house-steward; (4) *Senāsanapaññāpaka*,[86] a regulator of lodging-places; (5) *Ajjhupekkhitar*,[87] caretaker; (6) *Aṭavīrakkhika*,[88] guardian of the forest; (7) *Coraghātaka*,[89] an executioner, (8) *Dovārika*,[90] door-keeper, etc.

According to the *Dhammapada Commentary*,[91] the king is recognised by the *rāja-muddā*, royal seal. The *Milindapañha*[92] says that an official is anxious for the seal and the office of its custody. In order to obtain the seal one sacrificed everything such as house-property, corn, gold and silver.

Pali literature mentions the office of an *Uparājā*, whose actual position in the administration is not known. As an *Uparājā* is generally appointed out of the sons of a king,[93] he may have been a deputy king assisting the *Rājā* in different works. The literal meaning of the word *Uparājā* suggests that he represented the king when he was ill or absent on an expedition. On the basis of the statements in the Jātakas, A. S. Altekar[94] says that the eldest son of a king became the crown-prince and his brothers were given responsible positions

83 *Ibid.*, Vol. II, p. 367; *Dhamma. Comm.*, Vol. IV, p. 88; cf. Fick, *op. cit.*, pp. 149-51. Cf. also *Agghakāraka*, valuator (*Jātaka*, Vol. I, p. 124).

84 *Suttanipāta*, verses 411-12; *Jātaka*, Vol. II, pp. 101, 305.

85 *Vinaya Piṭaka*, Vol. II, p. 167.

86 *Ibid.*, pp. 75, 176; Vol. III, p. 158.

87 *Saṁyutta.*, Vol. V, p. 69; *Vibhaṅga*, p. 227.

88 *Jātaka*, Vol. II, p. 335.

89 *Ibid.*, Vol. III, p. 178; Vol. V, p. 303; *Aṅguttara.*, Vol. II, p. 207; *Peta. Comm.*, p. 5.

90 *Dīgha.*, Vol. III, pp. 64-65; also *Kurudhamma Jātaka* (*Jātaka*, Vol. II, p. 367); *Dhammapadaṭṭhakathā*, Vol. IV, p. 88.

91 Vol. I, p. 21.

92 See p. 124.

93 Altekar, *op. cit.*, p. 123; *Jātaka*, Vol. I, p. 259; Vol. III, pp. 123, 407; Vol. IV, pp. 96, 316; Vol. V, p. 177. Sometimes the eldest among the younger brothers of the king was anointed *Uparājā* when the king had no male descendant (*Jātaka*, Vol. II, p. 367).

94 *Op. cit.*, pp. 84-85.

like governorship or viceroyality. Thus *Uparājā* may be identified with *Padesarājā* or provincial ruler. *Uparājā* was, however, not regarded as a provincial administrator. The *Ekapaṇṇa Jātaka*[95] mentions *Uparājās*, generals and treasurers corresponding in number to the seven thousand seven hundred and seven kings. Besides, in the administration of justice, the commentary of the *Mahāparinibbānasutta* says that every matter must go to the *Uparājā* before the final judgement is made by the Rājā. These facts suggest that there was only one *Uparājā* who took seat by the side of a king and acted as his assistant in his administrative work. The *Khaṇḍahāla Jātaka*[96] says that *Uparājā* is appointed as a king's judge for his efficiency.

The village headman represented the king in the village, collected taxes from the villagers and, with the help of the local people, secured the country against the inroads of robbers.[97] The *Milindapañha*[98] says that under the village headman there is an officer who made public announcements in the village and, through this office, the governor of the village gave orders to the villagers. The village headman had also some judicial power. In the *Ubhatobhaṭṭha Jātaka*,[99] a fisherman's wife was fined by him 'for stirring up a quarrel'. But serious cases could not be judged by the headman himself; they had to be sent to the royal court for decision.[100] He could issue orders for prohibiting the slaughter of animals and the sale of strong drinks.[101] Sometimes a minister was appointed to rule a village; but he was punished by the king when he was in league with the robbers to loot the village.[102] Similarly if the governor of a village acted against the villagers, he was

95 *Jātaka*, Vol. I, p. 504.
96 *Ibid.*, Vol. VI, p. 131.
97 *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 354.
98 See p. 147.
99 *Jātaka*, Vol. I, p. 482.
100 R. C. Majumdar, *op. cit.*, p. 138.
101 *Jātaka*, Vol. IV, p. 14.
102 *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 354.

punished by the king. He was degraded and another headman was appointed in his place.[103] The *Kulāvaka Jātaka*[104] says that the villagers took active part in the village administration. The *Gahapati Jātaka*[105] shows that villagers punished the headman if he had lost his character. R. C. Majumdar[106] observes that the appointment of a headman directly by the king was not the general practice. He thinks that, as the villagers transacted their own affairs, it was possible that the selection of headman was made by the villagers.[107] He points out that, though the headman had considerable executive and judicial authority, the popular voice operated as a great and efficient control over his decisions.

The judiciary is an important department of the government. The first people of the world founded a state and government for getting judgement according to written law, as stated in the *Tuṇḍila Jātaka*.[108] The *Milindapañha*[109] refers to law books and says that a prince should know the law of property.[110] The *Petavatthu Commentary*[111] speaks of a law-giver designated as *Niticintaka*. According to the *Dhammapadaṭṭhakathā*[112] and the Jātakas,[113] a case is judged in the *Vinicchayaṭṭhāna* or *Vinicchayasālā*.

In a monarchical state, a king is the sole authority for conducting the administration of justice. Criminal jurisdiction is exclusively exercised by the king. Those who commit serious crimes, such as theft, adultery and bodily injury are

103 *Loc. cit.*
104 *Ibid.*, p. 199.
105 *Ibid.*, Vol. II, p. 136.
106 *Op. cit.*, p. 128.
107 *Ibid.*, pp. 127-28.
108 *Jātaka*, Vol. III, pp. 286ff.
109 See pp. 80, 189.
110 *Ibid.*, pp. 3, 178.
111 See p. 130.
112 Vol. III, pp. 141, 380 ; Vol. IV, p. 215.
113 *Jātaka*, Vol. IV. p. 120 ; Vol. V, p. 229.

punished by *rājāṇā*, i.e., punishment inflicted by the king.[114]

According to the *Rājovāda Jātaka*,[115] the final administration of law rested with the king who pronounced the final decision in law-suits as well as the final word regarding the punishment for disobeying the law.

The commentary on the *Parinibbāna Sutta*[116] describes administration of justice at Vesālī, the chief town of the Licchavis, and points out that a criminal case passed through various officers for its final decision. In the first instance, the criminal was placed before the *Vinicchaya-mahāmatta*. They could acquit the accused if he was innocent; but, if they thought that the criminal was guilty, they could not punish him, but had to send him to the next higher tribunal, where the *Vohārika* decided whether the accused was guilty; if he was innocent, he was acquitted; but in case he was guilty, he would have been sent to the next higher court of the *Suttadhara*. In the same order, the accused was under trial by other three tribunals, namely, those of the *Aṭṭhakulaka*, *Senāpati* and *Uparājā*. The last tribunal was held by the *Rājā* who could punish the accused if he was found guilty, under the guidance of the *paveṇi-potthaka*, 'the Book of Customs'.* Thus it is found that even in the administration of a non-monarchical state,[117] the decision for a case remained in the hands of the king. Sometimes the judge appointed by king misled him by a false judgement. When a king learnt that a judge used to take bribes and dispossess the real owners and put wrong owners in possession, he discharged him and appointed a new judge who would rightly decide a suit.[118]

As mentioned above,[119] a king had a *Vohārika-mahāmatta*,

---

114 Fick, *op. cit.*, p. 112, note 2.

115 *Jātaka*, Vol. II, p. 2.

116 Fick, *op. cit.*, p. 107, note 1; R. C. Majumdar, *op. cit.*, p. 224.

[The above-mentioned system seems to be more theoretical than practical although its spirit may have been recognised generally.—Ed.]

117 Vesāli was one of the non-monarchical States.

118 E.g., see *Jātaka*, Vol. VI, p. 131.

119 See p. 119.

the minister of law, with the help of whom he took decisions for punishing criminals. But there is also evidence that the king sentenced a criminal without previously consulting the ministers. Sometimes he did not examine the case and pronounced a false judgement.[120] According to the *Vaṭṭaka*,[121] *Avāriya*[122] and *Rathalaṭṭhi*[123] *Jātakas*, the king alone pronounced the judgement without any investigation. The *Rathalaṭṭhi Jātaka*[124] says that the *Vinicchay-āmacca* (the minister of justice) protected one against the unjust judgement of a king and maintains that the king should not take a decision without investigation. Besides the *Vinicchy-āmacca*, the *Purohita* and *Senāpati* took part in the administration of justice and advised the king and, in some cases, exercised influence upon the king's judgement.[125] Richard Fick[126] says that Pali literature is silent about the general control of the priestly caste over the administration. He also points out that, in the Jātakas, the position of the king was unaffected by the priestly organisation.

Although the king was the highest authority in the matter of administration of justice, the entire judicial function did not lie in the hands of the king. He had to delegate his powers to the minister on account of increased population and extension of territory. Generally the administration of justice of the smaller towns and villages was conducted by the king's representatives until and unless an appeal was made against their judgements to the king.[127]

In respect of *daṇḍanīti*, Pali literature speaks of various types of punishments. The *Milindapañha* says that the man who commits a crime has to suffer different tortures, e.g., cut-

120 *Jātaka*, Vol. IV, p. 29.
121 *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 433.
122 *Ibid.*, Vol. III, p. 232.
123 *Op. cit.*, pp. 104f.
124 *Loc. cit.*
125 Fick, *op. cit.*, p. 111.
126 *Ibid.*, p. 99.
127 *Ibid.*, pp. 111-12; *Jātaka*, Vol. II, p. 182; Vol. V, p. 229.

ting off of hands or feet, flogging, casting into bonds, execution, degradation in rank and deprivation of goods.[128] Regarding these punishments, the Buddhist view is that the evil-doers are to be subdued and not to be injured. On one occasion,[129] it says that a man who abuses others and rarely speaks the truth has to pay a small fine of a *kahāpaṇa*, a copper coin equal to about $\frac{1}{3}$ shilling. The same punishment is given to a person who slaps another with his hand.[130] The *Vaṭṭaka*[131] and other *Jātakas*[132] speak of capital punishment. The *Kulāvaka Jātaka*[133] says that, if a village headman works against the villagers, he is made a slave of the villagers by the king. The *Ubhatobhaṭṭha Jātaka*[134] says that a fisherman's wife was tied up for stirring up a quarrel and was beaten to make her pay the fine.

Buddhist literature mentions some republican states of North-Eastern India. The administrative body of these states was almost the same as that of the monarchical states. According to the *Kuṇāla* and *Ekapaṇṇa Jātakas*, the rulers of the republican states were kings of a particular clan and not the representatives of the whole people. According to the said Jātakas, a state is ruled by many kings. The former mentions 2500 kings of the Sākiya clan,[135] and the latter speaks of 7,707 kings of the Licchavi clan. R. C. Majumdar thinks that the state under the rule of Licchavi kings was divided into 7,707 administrative

128 See pp. 40, 57, 171, 185 ; Cf. *Jātaka*, Vol. III, p. 180. The *Vinaya Piṭaka*, Vol. I, p. 74, speaks of cutting off of head, tearing out of tongue and breaking half of the evil-doers' ribs. It also mentions (*ibid.*, p. 75) that the robbers were imprisoned in the jail.

129 *Milindapañha, loc. cit.*

130 *Ibid.*, p. 193.

131 *Jātaka*, Vol. I, p. 438.

132 *Ibid.*, Vol. III, p. 232.

133 *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 198.

134 *Loc. cit.* ; see also above p. 123, note 99.

135 Majumdar, *op. cit.*, p. 227.

units[136] as the *Ekapaṇṇa Jātaka* states that each king has a complete set of officers.[137]

As mentioned above,[138] the Central Government of a non-monarchical State was controlled by the Central Assembly and provincial administration was managed by the members of this assembly. In a *Gaṇa* state, members of this assembly were the members of the *rājakula* and were designated as kings. On account of this, it is doubtful whether there was any member in the Central Assembly elected from the general people. We have to admit that there was no party system and therefore no perfect democracy in ancient India. The share-holders, i.e. princes of a republican State, took part in the administration through the Central Assembly. Thus the republican States may be called a confederacy of share-holders of a ruling clan rather than democracy.

As stated above,[139] the head of an administrative unit had a full suite of officers for administering the State. Since the

136 A. S. Altekar refutes Bhandarkar's view that the Licchavis' was a confederation of 7,707 principalities and says that 'such a big confederacy is impracticable'. It is better to think that, as 7,707 kings belonged to the Licchavis who divided their kingdom into 7,707 shares (provinces) for themselves and each of them became a king of a particular province. But they did not rule their provinces separately ; they preserved unity under a Central Assembly. The *Mahāparinibbānasutta* (*Dīgha.*, Vol. II, pp. 72ff. ; see also *Digha. Comm.*, Vol. II, p. 519 ; Rhys Davids, *Gradual Sayings*, Vol. IV, pp. 10ff.) describes their strength of unity. In this Sutta, the Buddha says that Ajātasattu, the king of Magadha, could not conquer the Vajjians (including the Licchavis) because the latter held full and frequent public assemblies over each and every matter. However, such a large number of share-holding kings in the small territory of the Licchavis seems to be doubtful. [The rule of an assembly of 7,707 members appears to be more fictitious and theoretical than real.—Ed.]

137 For a list of officers like *Uparājā, Senāpati, Bhaṇḍāgārika*, etc., see *Jātaka*, Vol. III, p. 1 ; and for judicial officers, see above, note 116 ; also see *Digha. Comm.*, Vol. II, p. 519. The *Saṁyutta.*, Vol. IV, p. 341, mentions a special body of officials (presumably police) attached to the Koliyan central authorities. They bore a bad reputation for extortion and violence.

138 See pp. 115-16.

139 See above, note 137.

Central Assembly possessed sovereign power, it controlled affairs, entertained ambassadors and foreign princes, considered their proposals and decided the issues of peace and war.[140]

However, though the non-privileged classes of a non-monarchical State had no position in the Central Assembly, A. S. Altekar[141] observes, on the basis of the *Mahāniddesa*, that the general people of a number of small villages and towns might have equal voice in local affairs as they had representatives in the village assemblies. The *Kuṇāla Jātaka*[142] states that, as and when quarrel arose between the sovereign republican States over the matter relating to the affairs of the general people, the people informed the officers of their own States, who in turn referred the matter to the kings so that a final decision might be taken by the kings whether war should be declared against the enemy country.[143] This shows that the general public had no power to take a decision on important topics, which rested with the Central Government.

In respect of judicial administration in the republican States of ancient India, the Pali literature speaks of true democratic spirit having safeguarded the right of the common people in the eyes of law, as we have seen above.[144]

---

140 See *Bhaddasāla Jātaka* in *Jātaka*, Vol. IV, p. 144.

141 *Op. cit.*, p. 124, note 2.

142 *Jātaka*, Vol. V, p. 413; *Dīgha. Comm.*, Vol. II, pp. 672ff.; *Dhammapadaṭṭhakathā*, Vol. III, pp. 254ff.

143 In the Gaṇa State, the resolution on any matter was passed by the Elders of the Central Assembly and not by the majority.

144 See above, p. 125.

XIV

OFFICIAL DESIGNATIONS IN EARLY MATHURĀ INSCRIPTIONS*

Kalyani Bajpeyi, Centre of Advanced Study in AIHC,
Calcutta University

The early inscriptions of Mathurā, most of which are mutilated and of a dedicatory nature, throw valuable light on the administrative history of the region in the ancient period. The foreign rulers like the Scytho-Parthians and the Kuṣāṇas introduced certain official designations in the Indian administrative system, some of which became popular with the indigenous Indian kings. A few such titles like *Kṣatrapa*, *Mahākṣatrapa* and *Gañjavara* are traced in the Mathurā inscriptions of the Śaka-Kṣatrapa period. Besides, mention may be made of some other officials like *Amātya* in the records of the Śuṅga period, *Balādhikṛta* and *Aśvavārika* in that of the Śaka-Kṣatrapa age and *Mahādaṇḍanāyaka*, *Vakanapati*, *Grāmika* and *Kāyastha* in the Kuṣāṇa regime. Unfortunately, however, no record of the Gupta period, discovered so far from Mathurā, mentions any official designation. In the following lines an attempt has been made to discuss in brief the designations noticed so far.

1. *Amātya—Amaca*[1] (*Amātya*) is mentioned in Mathurā records belonging to the Śuṅga period. Most of the twenty-six inscribed bricks at the second Gaṇeśrā mound are broken ; but there is mention of king Gomitra's *Amātya* Rohadeva Kohaḍa (*Gomitasa amacena Rohadevena Kohaḍena*). The *Amātyas* (ministers), one of the seven constituent elements of the State,[2]

[The revised copy of the paper was received in March, 1972.—Ed.]

1 Lüders, *Math. Ins.*, ed. K. L. Janert, 1961, pp. 158-59 ; cf. Sircar, *Ind. Ep. Gloss.*, 1966, p. 16.

2 For the seven elements, viz. *Svāmin* (ruler), *Amātya* (minister), *Janapada* (the territory of State and its people), *Durga* (fortified city or capital), *Koṣa* (accumulated wealth in the ruler's treasury), *Daṇḍa* (army), and *Mitra* (friends or allies), see *Kauṭilīya Arthaśāstra*, VI. 1 ; *Manusmṛti*, IX. 294 ; *Yājñavalkyasmṛti*, I. 353 ; *Viṣṇu Dharmasūtra*, III. 33 ; *Agni Purāṇa*, 244.12. [*Amātya* seems to mean here 'the official machinery'.—Ed.]

occupy an important position in the administration and without their help a successful rule is impossible.[3]

Relying on the early Pāli texts, R. S. Sharma[4] suggests that the *Amātyas* in the pre-Maurya times were officers of a general category; in the beginning, they were the king's friends, companions and courtiers; but gradually, they were appointed in large numbers as supervisors of sale-transactions, judges, guides in worldly and spiritual matters, surveyors, village headmen, etc. According to Kauṭilya,[5] the *Amātyas* should be appointed in charge of various fields of administration like the agricultural operations, fortifications, welfare of the territory, prevention of adversities, punishment of the criminals, collection of royal dues, etc. The king's high officials such as the chief-priest, ministers, collectors, treasurers, officers engaged in civil and criminal administration, officers in charge of the harem, envoys and superintendents of various departments were to be recruited from among the *Amātyas*.[6] Kauṭilya[7] further states that they should be appointed in sufficient number according to the requirement of the administration, though the *Mantrins* should be only three or four. As regards the qualifications of the *Mantrins*, noble birth was essential, and hereditary holding of posts was preferable, though not indispensable. One who passed only a few tests was considered eligible for the post of the *Amātya*. An *Amātya* was possibly also called a *Saciva*; cf. *Mati-Saciva* and *Karma-saciva* in the Junagarh rock inscription[8] of Rudradāman, who are described as endowed with the qualities of the *Amātya*.

2. *Kṣatrapa* and *Mahākṣatrapa*—The Śaka rulers, viz. Ruñjuvula, Śoḍāsa, Hagāna, Hagāmaṣa, Taraṇadāsa, Ghaṭāka,

3 *Arthaśāstra*, I. 7.9; *Manusmṛti*, VII. 54-57; *Matsya Purāṇa*, 215. 2-6; *Yājñavalkyasmṛti*, I. 312.

4 *Aspects of Political Ideas and Institutions in Ancient India*, 1959, pp. 16-17.

5 *Arthaśāstra*, VIII. 1. 8, 23.

6 *Ibid.*, I. 9-10, 16.

7 *Loc. cit.*

8 Sircar, *Sel. Ins.*, Vol. I, 1965, p. 180.

Śivadatta and Śivaghoṣa enjoyed the title *Kṣatrapa* or *Mahākṣatrapa*. The lion-capital inscriptions[9] mention Śoḍāsa as *Kṣatrapa* and as the son of *Mahākṣatrapa* Rañjuvula, while, in his own records, Śoḍāsa is found to enjoy the higher title *Mahākṣatrapa*[10] and is described also as the son of *Mahākṣatrapa* Rañjuvula.[11] The coins[12] issued by Śoḍāsa bear the following legends in Brāhmī on the obverse : (a) *Mahākhatapasa putasa Khatapasa Śoḍāsasa*, (b) *Rājuvula-putasa Khatapasa Śoḍāsasa*, (c) *Mahākhatapasa Śoḍāsasa*. The coins of the first two types were issued, as suggested by Allan,[13] during the life-time of his father and coins of the third group during his own rule. Sircar[14] thinks that "the relation between the *Mahākṣatrapa* and the *Kṣatrapa* was something like that between the *Rājan* and the *Yuvarāja* ruling at the same time from the same station or from different stations."

The word *Kṣatrapa* is derived from old Persian *Khshathrapāvan* essentially meaning 'protector of the land or realm', but usually indicating 'a provincial governor'.[15] Sircar[16] suggests that *Chatrapati*, the late Marāṭhī royal title 'is an echo of *Chatrapa*, the Prakrit from of *Kṣatrapa*'. In the Persian administrative system, the designation *Satrap* indicated the head of a province who was entrusted with many powers and responsibilities.[17]

The title *Mahākṣatrapa* adopted by Rañjuvula was known not only from the lion-capital records and the Brāhmī coin-

9 *Ibid.*, pp. 114, 116-17.

10 *Ibid.*, pp. 120-22 ; Lüders, *op. cit.*, p. 204.

11 Sircar. *Sel. Ins., op. cit.*, p. 122.

12 Allan, *BMC*, pp. 190-91, Pl. XXVI. 6, 18 ; Pl. XLIII. 15.

13 *Ibid.*, p. cxvi.

14 Sircar. *Sel. Ins., op. cit.*, p. 114, note 2.

15 Rapson, *Cat.*, 1967, p. c. ; H. C. Raychaudhuri, *PHAI*, 1953, p. 443 ; J. N. Banerjea in *Comp. Hist. Ind.*, Vol. II, 1957, ed. Sastri, p. 263 ; Sircar, *Ind. Ep.*, 1965, pp. 333, 353.

16 *Sel. Ins.*, Vol. I, p. 114, note.

17 See S. Bandyopadhyay in *Foreigners in Anc. Ind. and Lakṣmī and Sarasvatī in Art and Literature*, ed. Sircar, 1970, p. 164 ; *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, Vol. XX, 1965, p. 8.

legend referred to earlier, but also from the legend *Mahakhatapasa aprati(hata*)cakrasa Rajulasa* written in Kharoṣṭhi on the reverse of his own coins.[18] As he seems to be the first *Kṣatrapa* who assumed the title *Mahākṣatrapa*, Sten Konow[19] suggests that the title *Mahākṣatrapa*, 'was not introduced long before the time of the lion capital'. This title does not indicate an independent position, though the Śakas of Western India appear to have continued to use the epithet *Mahākṣatrapa* even when they ruled independently.

3. *Mahādaṇḍanāyaka*—This designation occurs in four Mathurā records[20] belonging to the Kuṣāṇa period. The persons appointed as *Mahādaṇḍanāyaka* seem to be foreigners as their names Ulāna, Valāna, Hummiyaka, etc., suggest.[21]

The title *Mahādaṇḍanāyaka* is superior to *Daṇḍanāyaka*. Both the designations are, for the first time, traced in the Kuṣāṇa inscriptions.[22] The word *daṇḍa* means both the army and the rod of punishment.[23] Hence the designation *Mahādaṇḍanāyaka* may etymologically indicate, as suggested by U. N. Ghoshal, a military and a judicial officer.[24] Others have taken it to mean a judge, a chief-officer of police, a high judicial officer, a great general, a magistrate, officer of the status of a colonel stationed in different districts in charge of local units, prefect of the police, etc.[25] D. C. Sircar[26] states that the

18 Allan, *op. cit.*, p. 187, Pl. XLIII. 21.

19 *CII*, Vol. II, Pt. I, 1929, p. xxxiv.

20 Lüders, *op. cit.*, pp. 66, 139, 158 ; *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. XXXIV, p. 10.

21 Lüders, *op. cit.*, p. 67 ; *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. XXIV, p. 206 ; Vol. XXXIV, p. 10. Lüders takes Ulāna and Valāna to be different forms of the same name.

22 *Proc. Ind. Hist. Cong.*, 1958, p. 68.

23 Monier-Williams' *Sans. Eng. Dict.*, s.v.

24 *The Beginnings of Indian Historigraphy and Other Essays*, 1944, p. 179.

25 See *CII*, Vol. III, p. 16, note ; *ASI,AR*, 1903-04, p. 109 ; 1911-12, Pt. II, p. 54 ; *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. XII, p. 43 ; Vol. XX, p. 32 ; Vol. XXIV, p. 206; *ASI, AR*, 1911-12, Pt. II, p. 55 ; 1914-15, p. 82; Majumdar, *Inscriptions of Bengal*, Vol. III, 1929, p. 185 ; Altekar, *State and Government in Ancient India*, 1958, p. 189; Stein's note on Kalhaṇa's *Rājatarangiṇī*, VII. 951.

26 Sircar, *Ind. Ep. Gloss.*, pp. 80-81, 175, 325.

Daṇḍanāyaka is probably a translation of Greek *Strategos* meaning 'a military commander', and that *Mahādaṇḍanāyaka* was primarily a commander of forces. R. N. Saletore[27] points out that these two types of officials performed both civil and military duties.

4. *Gañjavara*[28]—This designation is found in a Jamālpur mound inscription[29] in which it is recorded that a Brāhmaṇa of the Śaigrava-gotra, who held the post of *Gañjavara* (treasurer) of *Mahākṣatrapa* Śoḍāsa, endowed a tank, a reservoir, a grove, a pillar and a stone-slab. The same epithet is found in the *Rājataraṅgiṇī*,[30] and the *Lokaprakāśa* ascribed to Kṣemendra.[31] *Gañjavara* is the same as Persian *Ganjwar* meaning 'treasurer' or 'store-keeper', derived from Persian *ganj* 'treasury', the Indianised form of which is *gañja*.[32] The word *gañja* meaning treasury is found in the *Rājataraṅgiṇī*, and also in Utpala's commentary on the *Bṛhatsaṁhitā*, where it is explained as *kośa-bhavana* (i.e. treasury).[33] Sometimes, the Indian words *pati* and *adhipati* are suffixed to it to indicate the same designation. *Gañjapati* is found in the Taleswar plate of Dyutivarman[34] and *Gañjādhipati* in the *Lokaprakāśa*.[35]

5. *Balādhikṛta—Baladhika*, a mistake for *Balādhikṛta*, a military title meaning 'the commander of an army',[36] occurs in a Kṣatrapa inscription[37] from the Girdharpur Ṭilā. It records the gift of a lady who was the wife of one called *Baladhika*. Literally the word *Balādhikṛta* indicates one who

27 Saletore, *Life in the Gupta Age*, 1943, pp. 236-37.
28 See S. Bandyopadhyay in *Foreigners in Anc. Ind.*, etc., p. 166.
29 Lüders, *op. cit.*, p. 99.
30 V. 177.
31 *Rājataraṅgiṇī*, Vol. I, trans. Stein, p. 210 and note.
32 Sircar, *Ind. Ep. Gloss.*, p. 112.
33 *Rājataraṅgiṇī*, IV. 589; *Bṛhatsaṁhitā* LII. 13; cf. *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. XXXV, p. 95.
34 *Ibid.*, Vol. XIII, p. 115.
35 Stein, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 210 and note.
36 Kane, *Hist. Dharm.*, Vol. III, p. 992; Sircar, *Ind. Ep. Gloss.*, p. 44.
37 Lüders, *op. cit.*, pp. 162-63.

is appointed to a command of the troops.[38] Superior to *Balādhikṛta* was *Mahābalādhikṛta* meaning a great commander'.[39] The designations *Balādhikṛta* and *Mahābalādhikṛta* are mentioned in several records.[40] Their synonyms are *Balādhyakṣa* and *Mahābalādhyakṣa* respectively.

6. *Aśvavārika*—It is mentioned in a Mathurā inscription[41] recording the erection of a railing by the *Aśvavārika* Bodhiyaśa, the son of Bodhila. *Aśvavārika* (Prakrit *Asavārika*;[42] cf. *Asavāraka*[43]) is the same as *Aśvavāra* meaning a trooper or horseman.[44] The cavalry officers were known as *Aśvapati* and *Mahāśvapati*.[45]

7. *Viśvāsika*—The designation *Viśvāsika* (cf. *Vaiśvāsika*, *Viśvasika*, *Viśvaśika* and *Viśvasaka*) is found in five Mathurā inscriptions[46] of the Kuṣāṇa period. In the three of the five records, it is the designation of a person named Vakamihira, while in the two other cases it is applied to Aśyala and to Ulāna. As pointed out by Lüders,[47] the post of *Viśvāsika* in the Kuṣāṇa period was enjoyed by foreigners. He further states that the *Viśvāsika* is the designation of some functionary of high rank. D. C. Sircar suggests that the titles *Viśvāsika* and *Rahasyādhikṛta* are synonymous, meaning 'a privy councillor' or 'private secretary'.[48]

8. *Kāyastha*—This designation has been recently noticed in a Mathurā record[49] of the time of the Kuṣāṇa king

38 Fleet, *op. cit.*, p. 210 note.

39 Kane, *op. cit.*, p. 997 ; Sircar, *Ind. Ep. Gloss.*, p. 174 ; Fleet, *op. cit.*, p. 109, note.

40 *Balādhikṛta* occurs in numerous inscriptions ; cf. Fleet, *op. cit.*, p. 210; *JBBRAS*, Vol. XVI, p. 110 ; for *Mahābalādhikṛta*, see Fleet, *op. cit.*, pp. 108, 128, 134.

41 Lüders, *op. cit.*, p. 202.

42 Lüders' List, No. 728.

43 *Ibid.*, No. 381.

44 Sircar, *Ind. Ep. Gloss.*, p. 35.

45 Kane, *op. cit.*, p. 977 ; Altekar, *op. cit.*, p. 343.

46 Lüders, *Math. Ins.*, pp. 91, 93, 98, 158.

47 *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. XXIV, p. 207.

48 Sircar, *Ind. Ep. Gloss.*, pp. 296, 360, 379.

49 *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. XXXVII, pp. 152-53.

Vāsudeva, dated in the year 93 (171 A. D.). The inscription records the dedication of a statue and an umbrella of the holy *Pitāmaha* (Buddha) by a *Kāyastha* named Śramaṇa during the reign of Vāsudeva. It is the earliest extant epigraphic reference to the designation *Kāyastha*. In the later periods, it occurs very often in inscriptions[50] of various areas as well as in literary works.[51] Kane[52] suggests that *Kāyastha* is a foreign word meaning an officer, and was used in the early centuries of the Christian era in the said sense. The meaning of the designation *Kāyastha*, as explained by Sircar,[53] suggests that he was 'an official, who usually sat beside his master in discharging his duties and was often the chief intermediary between the master and the latter's clients or subjects'. The official was generally considered as 'the professional scribe'. According to mediaeval lexicons, as pointed out by Sircar, *Kāyastha* and *Karaṇa* (cf. also *Pañjikāraka* and *Kūṭakṛt*)[54] are synonymous, meaning the writer of documents. Sircar further says that the *Kāyastha*, as suggested by the literary and epigraphic data, was not merely the writer of documents, but that he was like the secretary or private secretary of modern times ; he was engaged also in the service of the king's officials like the collector of revenue, minister, magistrate, judge, etc.[55]

9. *Grāmika*—This designation is found in two Mathurā inscriptions of the Kuṣāṇa period. One[56] of them, dated in the year 40 (118 A. D.), records the dedication of a Jaina image by Sihadattā, the wife of the *Grāmika* Jayanāga and the daughter-in-law of the *Grāmika* Jayadeva. The other inscrip-

50 Cf. Kane, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, Pt. I, p. 77 ; Sircar, *Studies in the Society and Administration of Ancient and Mediaeval India*, Vol. I, 1967, p. 159.

51 *Viṣṇu Dharmasūtra*, VII. 3 ; *Yājñavalkyasmṛti*, I. 322 ; *Uśanaḥsmṛti*, 35 ; *Vedavyāsasmṛti*, I. 10-11 ; *Rājataraṅgiṇī*, V. 130-84 ; VIII. p. 159.

52 Kane, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, Pt. I, p. 76.

53 Sircar, *Stud. Soc. Adm.*, etc., Vol. I, pp. 161-62.

54 *Ibid.*, pp, 158-59.

55 *Ibid.*, pp. 159-61.

56 Lüders' List, No. 48.

tion[57] of Vāsudeva's reign, dated in the year 84 (162 A. D.), refers to a *Grāmika* whose wife installed an image of the Arhat Ṛṣabha. The post of the village officer appears to have been sometimes hereditary as is evident from the first of the inscriptions mentioned above. The existence of the village-headman in the earlier period can be traced in literary and epigraphic sources.[58] According to Manu, the village headman was appointed by the king,[59] and that maintenance of law and order and collection of revenue from the village were the duties of the village-headman.[60] If law and order were at stake, he could, according to the exigency of situation, approach the headman of ten villages for the maintenance of peace.[61] The defence of the village, is supposed to have also been in the hands of the village-headman.[62] But according to Sharma,[63] in the Kuṣāṇa period, he was not performing military functions as we learn from Manu.[64] Mention is made of a separate official who

57 *Ibid.*, No. 69a. In this fragmentary inscription what Lüders reads doubtfully as *Grāmika*, R. D. Banerji reads *gadhika* (*JPASB*, NS, Vol. V, p. 277). In another record, V. S. Agrawala (*JUPHS*, Vol. XXIII, p. 111) reads *Padrapā[le]na* meaning 'by the chief of a village', which Lüders (*op. cit.*, p. 52) reads as *āḍīha[ke]na*. Again, *paṭima Hastakena* (i.e. the image made by Hastaka) read by Sircar in one inscription (*JUPHS*, Vol. II, New Series, 1954, p. 12) had been previously read and interpreted by Agrawala (*ibid.*, Vol. XXI, p. 75) as *Padra-mahasthakena*, 'by the village headman'.

58 *Grāmaṇi*, synonym of *Grāmika*, is mentioned in the Vedic literature (see *Rgveda*, X. 62.11 ; 107.5 ; *Atharvaveda*, III. 5.7 ; XIX. 31.12 ; *Tai. Saṁ.*, II. 5.4 ; *Śat. Br.*, V. 4.4.19). King Bimbisāra is said to have appointed 80,000 *Grāmikas* in his kingdom (see *Mahāvagga*, V. 1). See also the *Arthaśāstra* (3.10.61), *Manusmṛti* (VII. 115-16), etc., and the Bhaṭṭiprolu Buddhist casket inscription (Lüders' List, No. 1333), Damodarpur plates of the Gupta period (*Ep. Ind.*, Vol. XV, No. 7(3)), etc.

59 *Manusmṛti*, VII. 115.

60 *Ibid.*, VII. 116-18.

61 *Loc. cit.*

62 *Vedic Index*, Vol. I, 1958, p. 247.

63 R. S. Sharma, *op. cit.*, p. 172.

64 VII. 114. [Though Manu does not speak of the *Grāmika's* military duties, there was really no division between 'Civil' and 'Military' in ancient Indian administration.—Ed.]

was appointed by the king for defence of two, three or five villages. Further, Manu throws light on the fact that the village official was paid neither in the form of fines exacted from the villagers nor in cash as it had been the custom of paying in the pre-Maurya and the Maurya period respectively.[65] Instead of wages, they enjoyed endowment of lands.[66]

10. *Bakanapati* or *Vakanapati*[67]—The designation occurs in three Mathurā inscriptions[68] of the Kuṣāṇa age. In one of them, it is stated that a *Bakanapati* of Takṣuma (?), probably Humaspala by name, constructed a temple, a garden, a tank, a well, an assembly hall and a gateway. In another epigraph, it is recorded that a *Bakanapati*, who was the son of a *Mahā-daṇḍanāyaka* and whose name began with *Śaukra*, reconstructed the temple of Huviṣka's grandfather. The third record refers to a *Vakanapati* who was *Kanasarukamāna-putra* and *Kharāsalera-pati* and endowed a *puṇyaśālā*.

Scholars are not unanimous regarding the interpretation of *Bakanapati*. Sten Konow[69] identifies Bakana and Vakana with Wakhan, a district of North-East Afghanistan which, according to him, is referred to in literature as Vokkāṇa, so that *Bakanapati* was the ruler of Wakhan. He further thinks that the damaged expression *Huṁ*.. following *Bakanapatinā* in the Mathurā inscription is the old name of Wakhan represented in Chinese as *Hiu-mi* or that of its capital *Hu-mo*. The suggestion of Sten Konow has been accepted by L. Bachhofer,

65 R. S. Sharma, *op. cit.*, p. 172.

66 *Manusmṛti*, VII. 119. [Land grant was not enjoyed by the Grāmika, for whose wages, see VII. 118.—Ed.]

67 S. Bandyopadhyay in *op. cit.*, pp. 170-71.

68 Lüders, *op. cit.*, pp. 135, 139-40; *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. XXI, p. 60. Jayaswal (*JBORS*, Vol. VI, 1920), p. 16) reads the word as *Barkanapati* and interprets it as 'the king of Varka' or 'the lord of the Varkas'. *Varka* and *Huma*, according to him, were the names of two amalgamated tribes of the Scythians.

69 *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. XXI, *loc. cit.*

V. S. Agrawala and D. C. Sircar.[70] Marshall and Vogel regard it as a title, but make no attempt to explain it.[71] H. W. Bailey[72] states that *Bakanapati* or *Vakanapati* is of Iranian origin meaning 'official in charge of temples (or a temple)'. His argument is that *pati* indicates not only 'lord' but also 'official in charge' in both the Indian and Iranian languages. Iranian *baga*, indicating god, with the suffix *-ana* becomes *bagana* meaning 'connected with the gods'. *Bakana* or *Vakana* being the same as *bagana*, the designation means 'official in charge of temples (or a temple)' in the inscriptions mentioning *devakula* or *puṇyaśālā*.[73]

70 Bachhofer in *JAOS*, Vol. LXI (1941), p. 250 and note 201 ; Agrawala in *JUPHS*, Vols. XXIV-V, p. 141 ; Sircar, *Sel. Ins.*, Vol. I, p. 152 and note 9.

71 Marshall in *ASI.AR*, 1911-12, Pt. I, p. 35 ; Vogel, *ibid.*, pp. 124-25.

72 *BSOAS*, Vol. XIV (1952), pp. 420-21.

73 Lüders, *op. cit.*, p. 137.

INDEX

Abdagases 33
Abhidhammapiṭaka 114
Abhimanyu 86, 89
Acintyapuruṣa (Viṣṇu) 3
Āditya-vaṁśa 92
Aelian 39n
Afghanistan 42, 138
Agathocleia 3, 17, 36
Agathocles 17n, 37-38, 41
Agghakāraka 122n
Agni 72, 102
Agni Purāṇa 130n
Agratya 30
Agrawala, V. S. 20n, 137n, 109
Agrodaka 31
Agroha 31
Aihole inscription 104n
Aitareya Brāhmaṇa 10, 12, 30, 102
Aiyangar, K. V. R. 95n
Aiyar, K. S. 69n
Ajātasattu 128n
Ajjhupekkhitar 122
Alexander 13, 24, 27
Alexandria 37
Allahabad 25, 27, 77
Allan 28, 132-33
Altekar, A. S. 26n, 27n, 47n, 69n, 72n, 81n, 95n, 116n, 119n, 122 and n, 128n, 129, 130n
Altheim 36 and n, 41
Amaca (Amātya) 130
Amārakoṣa 76n
Amātya 130 and n, 131
Ambālikā 19
Ambikā 19
Amoghabhūti (Kuṇinda k.) 28
Ananta 113
Anantaśāyin Viṣṇu 113
Anantavarman Coḍagaṅgadeva 90
Andhra Pradesh 90n
Aṅguttara-nikāya 115n, 118, 120n, 121n, 122n
Antialcidas 35, 36n
Antimachus I 36-41
Antimachus II 40 and n, 41, 43
Antiochus I 33 and n
Antiochus II 33, 38, 40
Antiochus III 17, 38-39
Antiochus IV 17n, 38-39
Antony 17n
Apavarktikene 36
Appolodotus I 37-38, 40-41
Arachosia 37 and n, 41
Aragalur temple 84
Arhat 9
Arius river 36
Arjunāyana 25, 27
Arthaśāstra 4, 9, 16, 20-21, 26, 28, 44-45, 62, 64 and n, 76n, 80 and n, 130-31, 137n
Āryaśarman (*Amātya*) 79
Asandhimitra 15
Asimbāḷa 81
Asirvatham, E. 74n
Aśoka 3, 9, 14-16, 21-23, 51, 60
Assakenoi 13
Aṣṭādhyāyī 3
Astauene 36
Aśvamedha 11, 12 and n
Aśvapati 135
Aśvavārika 130, 135
Aśvins 19
Aśyala 135
Atargatis 17n

Aṭavīrakkhika 122
Atharvaveda 10n, 137n
Athena 17, 41
Aṭṭhakulaka 125
Audumbara 27-28
Avadānaśataka 25
Avantivarman 47 and n
Avariya Jātaka 126
Āyakammika 121
Ayodhyā
Babylon 34
Bachhofer, L. 138, 139n
Bactria 33-35, 37-41
Badami 101n
Bagehot 68n
Bahadur 57n
Bahudhānyaka 31
Bailey, H. W. 139
Bajaur hoard 40
Bajpai, K. D. 74n
Bajpeyi, Sm. K. 1, 5, 130
Bakana 138 ; *pati* 138, 139n
Bakon 102, 105
Baladhika 134
Balādhikṛta 130, 134, 135 and n
Balādhyakṣa 135
Bālguḍi 84
Balipaṭiggāhaka 121
Balisādhaka 121
Bāmaṇḍā 88 ; paṭṭi 88
Banaras 95n
Banda 77n
Bandyopadhyay, S. 2, 132n, 134n, 138n
Banerjea, J. N. 132n
Banerji, R. D. 137n
Ba-phnom 93
Barkanapati 138n
Barker, E. 69n
Barnala 29 and n
Barth 94n
Barua, B. M. 14n, 46n
Basak, R. G. 13n, 14, 16n
Basarh 76
Basu, Jogiraj 10n, 12
Baturu 57n
Baud 87
Beas 27
Behera, K. S. 86
Beni Prasad 22n, 23n
Bergaigne 74n
Besnagar 14
Bhaddasāla Jātaka 129n
Bhadrika (*Amātya*) 76, 78
Bhāgavata Purāṇa 99n
Bhagavatī 109
Bhagīratha 86
Bhāṇḍāgārika 121, 128n
Bhandarkar, D. R. 25n, 30n, 71n, 128n
Bharata 50, 72-73, 86
Bhārat Kalā Bhavan 77 and n
Bhārgava 98n
Bharu Jātaka 117
Bhattacharya, K. 96, 100n, 112
Bhattacharya, R. K. 2
Bhaṭṭisoma 29 and n
Bhattiprolu Buddhist Casket inscription 137n
Bhīmaratha 87
Bhoja Paramāra 47, 86
Bhojapura 47
Bhita 76
Bhṛgu 102n
Bhubaneswar 87n
Bijaygarh inscription 8
Billorey, R. K. 1, 9, 21
Bimbisāra 115n, 137n
Bodh-Gayā 67
Bodhila 135
Bodhiyasa 135
Bola (*Amātya*) 79
Bosch, F. C. K. 93n
Bota (*Amātya*) 78
Boulger, D. C. 57n
Brahman 98n, 99-104, 110-12

Brāhmaṇa 5-6, 22-23, 59, 72, 79, 81-82, 109, 134
Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇa 99n
Brahmaṇyadeva (Kārttikeya) 31
Brahmeśvara (Śiva) 87; temple inscription 86-87
Brāhmī 79n, 132
Bṛhaddharma Purāṇa 99n
Bṛhaspati 79n, 98n
Bṛhat-Parāśara 101n
Bṛhatsaṁhitā 48, 134 and n
British Museum 35, 77
Brown, D. M. 72n
Bruxelles 95n
Buddha 24, 128n, 136
Bühler, G. 14, 16n, 19n
Cakkavāla-Cakkavatti 115
Cakkavatti 115
Cakrapālita 47
Calcutta 20n, 26n, 91, 93n, 95n, 100n, 103n
Caliph 73
Calliope 18, 36
Cālukya—dynasty 101n; Vikramāditya-Satyāśraya 104n
Cambodia 2-3, 91-92, 94, 96, 100 and n, 102, 105, 107, 109
Cambridge 14n
Caṇḍīhara 86 and n
Candragupta 3-4
Candragupta Maurya 46
Catreśvara Śiva 32
Cetiya Jātaka 117
Ceylon 119
Chakrabortty, S. K. 28n
Chakravarti, A. K. 1-2, 6, 91
Chandravalli stone inscription 47n
Chatrapati 132
Chatterjee, A. K. 1-2, 4, 62
Chatterjee, B. 1, 3, 6-7, 44
Chhatrasal Museum 77n
Chindaka-Nāga dynasty 89
Chitor 30-31
Chok Gargyar (Koh Ker) 105n
Clay, A. T. 18n
Coḍagaṅgadeva 90n
Coedes, G. 91, 92n, 93 and n, 94 and n, 96, 108, 113
Coḷa 7
Coraghātaka 122
Cowell, E. B. 14n
Culladhammapāla Jātaka 117
Cullavagga 120
Cunningham 36
Curtius, Q. 13
Cuttack District 87, 89
Dacca 90n
Dakṣa 111
Dalai Lama 73
Damodarpur plates 137n
Daṇḍakāraṇya 98n
Daṇḍanāyaka 133
Daṇḍa-niti 50
Daṇḍaviveka 8n
Dantidurga 101n, 104n
Das, S. R. 1, 6
Daśaratha 75
Dasgupta, K. K. 1, 8
Daulatabad 4
Dekmeior 95n
Demetrius I 34-37, 39, 41
Devagiri fort 4
Devarāja 103, 106, 107n
Devī (Queen of Aśoka) 14-15
Dhammacetiya Sutta 46
Dhammapada 121, 122 and n
Dhammapadaṭṭhakathā 115n, 120, 122n, 124, 129n
Dharaghoṣa (Audumbari) 27-28
Dharaṇīndravarman I 108-09
Dharmadeva 79
Dharma, P. C. 68n
Dharmaratha 86, 89-90
Dharmavivardhana 15
Dhṛtarāṣṭra 19
Dhuṇḍirāja 96n

Digha-nikāya 114 and n, 117-18, 121 and n, 122n, 128n
Dikshit, R. K. 78n
Diksitar, V. R. R. 21
Dilipa 86
Dipa-Cakkavatti 115
Disāmpati 117
Divākara-bhaṭṭa 109
Divākara-paṇḍita 108
Divyāvadāna 14-15
Doṇamāpaka-Mahāmatta 121 and n
Dovārika 122
Draupadī 19
Dupont, P. 96
Durvinita (Gaṅga king) 81
Dvārakā 62-63
Dyutivarman 134
Egypt 35
Ekāmra 87
Ekapaṇṇa Jātaka 116n, 123, 127-28
Epander 41, 43
Erakiṇa 31 and n
Eucratides 17-18, 35, 38-41
Europe 73
Euthydemus I 34-35
Euthydemus II 37
Fick 80n, 117n, 118, 120n, 121n, 122n, 125n, 126 and n
Filliozat, J. 100
Finot, L. 92n, 94n, 95n, 111
Fleet 135n
Fou-nan 92-95
Gahapati Jātaka 124
Gāmabhoja 115
Gāmaṇī 115
Gāmika 115 and n
Gaṇaka-Mahāmatta 121
Gandhāra 40-41
Genesra mound 130
Ganguli, D. C. 90n
Ganguli, D. K. 1, 3, 6-7, 10
Gaṅga dynasty 89-90, 101n
Gañjādhipati 134
Gañjapati 134
Gañjavara 130, 134
Ganjwar 134
Garner, J. W. 67n, 68n, 70n, 71n, 74n, 75n
Garuḍa 110
Gautama 49
Geiger, W. 14n
Genghis Khān 57n
Ghaṭāka 131
Ghoshal, U. N. 44n, 95n, 97n, 99n, 102n, 133
Girdharpur Ṭilā 134
Girinagara 46
Giriśa (Śiva) 93
Gokhale, B. G. 69n
Gomitra 130
Gonda, J. 95n
Gondophares 33
Govinda II (Rāṣṭrakūṭa) 51
Grāmaṇī 137n
Grāmika 130, 136, 137 and n, 138n
Greece 26
Gupta, P. L. 28n
Gustavus Adolphus 65
Hagāmaṣa 131
Hagāna 131
Haldar, J. R. 1, 9, 114
Hall, D. G. E. 93n
Harṣa 101n
Harṣadatta 88
Harṣavarman I 112
Harṣavarman II 110
Hari (Viṣṇu) 96
Hariana 31n
Harikambuja 96n
Harikambujendra 96
Harikesarin (Kadamba king) 83
Harivaṁśa 99n
Hastabala (*Amātya*) 76, 78
Hastaka 137n
Hastika (*Amātya*) 78
Hathigumpha inscription 46n

Heine Geldern 93n
Heliocles 17, 36n
Heraññika 121
Hercules 13
Hermaeus 18, 36
Hippostratus 18
Hissar District 31 and n
Hiuen-t'ien 91-92
Hobehouse, L. T. 70n
Hopkins, W. 20n, 95n
Hosahoḷalu 83
Humaspala 138
Hummiyaka 133
Huviṣka 138
Hyderabad plates 101n
Ikṣvāku 29
Imbert, M. Jean 107n
Indra 72, 96-103, 110-13
Indralakṣmī 109
Indraprastha 92
Indraratha 86
Indravarman 99n, 102-03, 110
Iran 37
Īśa 113
Īśānavarman I 95
Isidatta 46
Isis 17n
Īśvaracandra (*Amātya*) 76, 79
Itivuttaka 115
Jagadekamalla II (Cālukya) 82
Jai Prakash 28n
Jaipur 87 ; District 29-30
Jaktinagar (in Baud) 87
Jamalpur 134
Janamejaya 86
Janamejaya II 88-90
Janapada 71
Janārdana 102n
Janārdana (*Amātya*) 77-79
Janert, K. L. 130n
Jarāsandha 62
Jatesinga-Dungri plates 88n
Jayaccandra 5
Jayadeva 136
Jayakeśin (Kadmba prince) 82
Jayanāga 136
Jayāpīḍa 51
Jayaswal, K. P. 11, 24n, 25n, 26, 27n, 138n
Jayavarman I 97-98, 110
Jayavarman II 99n, 110, 102, 107n, 110, 112
Jayavarman IV 110, 112
Jayavarman V 99n, 103 and n, 107, 110-11, 113
Jayavarman VI 111-12
Jayavarman VII 104, 110-13
Jayavarman Parameśvara 110
Jayavīravarman 110, 112-13
Jayendravarman 108 and n
Jenevāḍi 85
Jenkins 3
Jha, A. K. 1, 9
Jha, Jagannath 100n
Jina 82
Jñāgaṇa 28
Junagadh 46n, 47n, 52
Justin 35
Jyeṣṭhrāyā-Kanteṅ Kamrateṅ aṅ ta Cpoṅ 98
Kadamba dynasty 7-8, 47
Kahāpaṇa 127
Kalabhaka 78
Kalhaṇa 47, 51, 133n
Kali 111
Kaliṅga 46, 86, 89, 90n
Kāma 95, 98
Kāmandaka 48
Kāmandakīya-Nītisāra 44, 79n
Kambuja (people) 96
Kambuja, Kambujadeśa (Cambodia) 94, 96-97
Kamsteṅ 107-08
Kane, P. V. 95n, 101n, 134n, 135n, 136 and n
Kangle 24n, 28n

Kang T'ai 91-92
Kantilo 87
Kapilaka 79
Kapilapura inscription 103
Kapiśā 37
Karachi 104n
Karaṇa 136
Karma-saciva 131
Karṇadeva 87, 88n, 90
Karṇāṭaka 82
Karpūraśrī 87
Kārttikeya 31-32, 79
Kāruvāki 15
Kashmir 47, 51
Kāśī 13n, 16
Kātyāyana 8n, 25 and n, 97n
Kauṇḍinya 2, 91-92
Kauśāmbī 15, 31 and n
Kauṭilya 3-4, 9, 16, 20, 21 and n, 24, 25 and n, 26 and n, 27, 44-45, 48, 55, 62-65, 98n, 131
Kāyastha 5-6, 130, 135-36
Keith 10n
Kelga plates 89-90
Kent, T. W. 74n
Khaṇḍahāla Jātaka 123
Khandapara Sub-Division 87
Khantivādī Jātaka 117
Khāravela 46
Kharoṣṭhī 40, 79n, 133
Khattiya 114 and n, 115-16, 118
Khmer country 94
Khshathrapāvan 132
Khuddakapāṭha 116
Kiḷalai-nāḍu 84
Kirtivarman II 101n
Kleophis 13
Koh ker 105n
Kok Rosei 105n
Kok Thlok 92
Kolāvatī 87
Koliya (people) 116
Koṅgoda 86
Konow, Sten 133, 138
Kosala 86-87, 89, 90 and n
Kosambi, D. D. 47n, 48 and n
Kosārakkha 121
Kṛṣṇa 103, 110-13
Kṛṣṇa Dvaipāyana 19
Kṛṣṇa (Vāsudeva) 62-63
Kṛṣṇa II (Rāṣṭrakūṭa king) 82
Kṛṣṇa (Yādava) 82
Kṛtyakalpataru 97n
Kṣatrapa 130-33 ; inscriptions 134
Kṣatriya 24, 97n
Kṣemendra 134
Kubera 99, 101-02, 111
Kudopali plates 88
Kulaipa 47
Kulāvaka Jātaka 124, 127
Kulūta (people) 27
Kumāradevī 4
Kumarisimha plates 90
Kuṇāla 15 ; *Jātaka* 116, 127-29
Kuṇinda, people 27, 28n, 32
Kurudhamma Jātaka 122n
Kuṣāṇa (clan) 5, 18, 47, 76-77, 130, 133, 135-38
Kūṭakṛt 136
Laḍahacandra 104
Lāhaḍapura inscription 5
Lahiri, A. N. 1, 3, 7-9, 33, 35n, 38n, 40n, 41n
Lahiri, Sm. B. 1, 7-8, 24, 32n
Lakṣmaṇa 85
Lakṣmī 98n
Lakṣmīdhara 8n
Laodice 17, 38
Leiden 95n
Leipzig 95n
Licchavi clan 8, 24n, 125, 127, 128n
Lieou-ye 91
Liṅgaparvata 93
Lingat, R. 105n
Ling-kia-po-po 93
Lohner grant 101n

Lokapāla 100
Lokaprakāśa 134
Lokkigundi 84
London 93n
Lucknow 95n
Lüders 130n, 133n, 134n, 135 and n, 136, 137n, 138n, 139n
Lysias 35 and n
Macdonell 10n
Machiavelli 67
Madhusūdana 86
Madhyadeśa 24
Madhyamikā 30-31
Mādirāja 82
Madras 21
Mādri 19
Magadha 128n
Mahābalādhikṛta 135 and n
Mahābalādhyakṣa 135
Mahābhārata 3-4, 8-9, 18-22, 25-26, 44-45, 50, 53, 56-57, 62-63, 65, 98n, 99
Mahābhāṣya 3
Mahābhavagupta 88
Mahābodhivaṁsa 14
Mahādaṇḍanāyaka 5, 130, 133-34, 138
Mahādeva 32
Mahājana 4, 81-85
Mahākṣatrapa 47, 130-31, 134
Mahalingam, T. V. 81n.
Mahānaṭṭa 119
Mahānadi 87
Mahāniddesa 129
Mahāparinibbāna Sutta 123, 128n
Maharashtra 82 and n
Mahāsammata 114
Mahāsenagutta 120
Mahaśivagupta Yayāti 88n
Mahasthan inscription 49
Mahāśvapati 135
Mahattara 81-82
Mahā-Ummaga Jātaka 66n
Mahāvagga 137n
Mahāvaṁsa 14-15, 116n, 117, 119
Mahendra (Indra) 14, 103, 112
Mahendra mountain 102, 105
Maheśa 113
Maheśvara 93, 104
Mahiṣi 10-12
Māhiṣmati 31 and n
Mahosadha 66n
Mahton, B. N. 69n, 73n, 75n
Mainamati plates 3, 104
Maity, S. K. 48n
Majjhimanikāya 46
Majumdar, R. C. 25n, 39n, 81n, 93n, 101n, 117n, 123n, 124, 125n, 127 and n, 133n
Mālava 25, 27 and n, 29-30 ; *gaṇa* 26
Malladatta II 88
Malwa 86, 101n
Māndhātṛ 86
Managoli inscription 82
Maninngavali 82
Maṇiyategare 81
Mantrin 131
Manu 3, 6, 19-20, 48-49, 78n, 79n, 80n, 98-102, 137-38
Manusmṛti 100n, 130n, 131n, 137n, 138n
Manu Vaivasvata 99
Margus 36
Marshall 38, 41, 76 and n, 139n
Maruleśvara 84
Marx 45n
Masperi, G. 91n
Massaga 13
Mathurā 5-6, 76, 130, 133, 135-36, 138
Mati-Saciva 131
Ma-touan lin 93n
Matsya Purāṇa 99n, 131
Maurya dynasty 14, 16, 21, 24
Mayūraśarman 47
McCrindle 27n, 45n, 80n
Mebon 106

Megasthenes 13, 45, 80 and n
Menander 9, 17, 36, 40-41, 43
Milindapañha 114, 117-24, 127n
Mishra, B. P. 1, 4, 9
Mi-son 92
Mithilā 66n
Mithridates I 18
Mitra, S. K. 3-4, 6, 8
Mme. Eve Porée-Maspéro 92n
Morgan, J. Pierpont 18
Mo-tan 93
Motichandra 77
Mudrārākṣasa 96n
Muhula 57n
Muttarasa (Gaṅga ruler) 101n
Nāgadāma 79
Nagai 85
Nagaraguttika 120
Nāgarāja 92
Nagaraśreṣṭhin 5
Nāgī Somā 92
Nahuṣa 86
Nala 86
Nandavaḍige (Bijapur Dist.) 83
Nandisoma 29 and n
Nandiyala 81
Nandsa *yupa* inscription 29
Napoleon 65
Nārada 50, 97n, 100 and n
Narain, A. K. 41
Narasiṁha 111
Narasiṁhapura plates 86
Nargund inscription 85
Neil, R. A. 14n
Nepal 8
New Delhi 77n
Nigama 71
Niggāhaka 121
Nilakaṇṭha 54n, 56
Nilamādhava 87
Nirili 83
Niṣka 2
Niti 50
Nitticintaka 124
Niti-śāstra 50
Nitivākyāmṛta 98n, 102n, 104
Nuapatna (Cuttack Dist.) 89
Nux Mois 91
Orissa 4, 89, 90n
Orthagnes 33 and n
Padakusalamāṇava Jātaka 118
Pādañjali Jātaka 119
Padesa-Cakkavatti 115
Padesa-rājā 115 and n, 123
Padesa-rajja 115
Padmāvatī 15
Pātāgali 10-12
Pallava dynasty 7-8
Paṇa 16
Pañcagaru Jātaka 117
Pañcatantra 54n
Pañcāyat 5
Pandae (Pāṇḍya) 13
Pāṇḍu 19
Pāṇḍya people 13
Pāṇini 3, 20 and n, 24, 25 and n, 27
Pañjikāraka 136
Pantaleon 37, 38 and n, 41
Paramāra dynasty 47, 90
Parameśvara 100, 112
Parameśvara (Śiva) 107n, 108
Paraśurāma 110
Pargiter 82n
Parinibbāna Sutta 124
Paris 91n, 92n, 93n, 95n, 100n
Parivṛkti 10 and n, 11-12
Parṇadatta 47, 52
Paropamisadae 35, 37 and n
Parthian 33
Paschimbhag plate 5
Pāṭaliputra 15-16
Patañjali 3
Pathak, V. 69n
Pāṭil 78n
Patna 2, 90
Paura 71

Pelliot, P. 91n, 93n, 96n
Perumakkāl 82
Petavatthu 117, 124
Phnoṁ-Da 96
Phnoṁ Penh 107n
Phraates II 18
Piṅgaleśa-Śiva 98
Piriyakera tank 83
Pitāmaha (Buddha) 136
Pnong 91
Polyxenus 41, 43
Pombukha 81
Poona 95n
Pope 73
Porshu 57
Prahasiteśvara Śiva 98
Prah Ko 105, 162
Prah Thoṁ 92
Prajāpati 11, 99-100, 102, 110-12
Prasad, B. 67
Prasat Car inscription 107-08
Prasat Comphus inscription 109n
Prasat Kantop inscription 108
Prasat Khna 105n, 108n
Prei Prasat inscription 112
Pre Rup inscription 106
Pṛthivīndravarman 99n
Pṛthiviṣena 78
Pṛthu 99 and n
Pṛthu-Vainya 99
Ptolemy IV Philometor 34, 35n
Ptolemy Neos Philopator 34
Pulakeśin I 104n
Pulakeśin II 101n
Puñja 88
Punjab 13, 24, 27, 30-31
Purāṇa 46
Purañjaya 90
Puri, K. N. 30n
Purigere 82
Purohita 126
Puṣkara (king of Śambhupura) 97 and n
Puṣkarākṣa 97n
Puṣkareśa 97
Puṣyagupta 46
Puvina-Padaṅgila 82
Raccuru 82
Rahasyādhikṛta 135
Rairh 30
Rāja-dharma 50
Rājadūta 122
Rajaguru, S. N. 87, 88n
Rāja-mahāmatta 119
Rājamalla 86
Rāja-nīti 50
Rājanītiprakāśa 101n
Rājanya 30, 100
Rājapativarman 107-08
Rāja-śāstra 50
Rajasthan 24
Rājasūya 11, 62
Rāja-tantra 50
Rājataraṅgiṇī 4, 47, 51, 133n, 134 and n, 136
Rāja-vṛtta 50
Rājendrabhadreśvara 106
Rājendracoḷa 86
Rājendravarman 103 and n, 106, 109-13
Rājendravarmeśvara 106
Rājendreśvara 106
Rajghat 76-78
Rajjugāhaka 122
Rājovāda Jātaka 125
Rājyasthalasvāmin 96, 105
Rāma 18, 50, 70, 72, 98n, 110
Rāmāyaṇa 4, 8, 18, 50, 67-70, 72-74, 79n, 80n, 97n
Rāmeśvara 85 ; temple 85
Raṇarāga 104n
Rao, M. V. K. 68n
Rapson, E. J. 132n
Rāṣṭrakūṭa dynasty 101n, 104n
Rathalaṭṭhi Jātaka 126
Ratnagiri charter 87, 88n

Ratnākara 8n
Rāvaṇa 74-75
Raychaudhuri, H. C. 132n
Reṇu 117
Ṛgveda 10 and n, 22n, 137n
Rhys Davids 128n
Ri...mu 18
Rocher, L. 95n
Rocher, Mrs. R. 95n
Rohadeva Kohaḍa 130
Rohtak District 31 and n
Rostovtzeff 36 and n, 41
Roy, P. C. 63
Ṛṣabha (Arhat) 137
Rudradāman 46n, 47 and n, 52
Rudradatta 88
Rudravarman 95
Rudravarman (Vemaki) 28, 30
Ruñjuvula 131-32
Sabbatthaka-Mahāmatta 119
Sabine, G. H. 67n
Saccaṁkira Jātaka 118
Saciva 131
Sadāśiva-Jayendravarman 108
Sahu, N. K. 87, 90n
Sahai, S. 100n
Śaigrava-gotra 134
Śaka-kṣatrapa 130
Sākiya clan 116, 127
Śālagrāma-śilā 97
Śālagrāmasvāmin 97
Salctore, R. N. 134 and n
Śālva 62, 64
Samangad inscription 101n, 104n
Samantapāsādikā 14
Śambhupura 97 and n
Śambhuvarmadeva 97n
Sammatideva 116
Saṁre 91
Saṁroṅ 96 ; inscription 108
Samudragupta 3, 25, 77
Saṁyuttanikāya 122n, 128n
Saṅghamitrā 14
Śaṅkara 104
Santiniketan 10
Sarkar, B. K. 95n
Sasan 33n
Sastri, K. A. N. 86n, 93-94, 132
Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa 10 and n, 11 and n, 12 and n, 97n
Satrap 132
Satyāśraya (Cālukya king) 104n
Śauri 110
Sāyaṇa 10
Scythian, people 33
Sdok Kak Thom inscription 102, 106n, 108n
Seistan 37 and n
Seleucia 34
Seleucus I 33 and n
Seleucus II 17, 38
Seligman, E. R. A. 67n, 70n
Seltman, Charles 33n
Sen, A. K. 95n
Senānāyaka 120 ; *Mahāmatta* 119
Senāni 120
Senāpati 120, 125-126, 128n
Senāsanagāhāpaka 122
Senāsanapaññāpaka 122
Sengupta, Sm. S. 1, 9
Śeṣa 98
Shama Sastry 64n, 65n
Sharma, R. S. 79n, 131, 138n
Shastri, A. M. 32n
Shembavnekar, K. M. 25n
Shepard, W. G. 67n, 74n
Śibi 30-31
Sihadattā 136
Śikharasvāmin 78n
Siṁha *(Mantrin)* 79n
Siṁhadatta 88
Sind 24
Singh, S. P. 1-2
Singur 85
Sircar, D. C. 1-9, 20n, 21n, 22n, 23n, 26n, 28n, 46n, 47n, 49n, 50-52, 57,

60, 79n, 87n, 89, 101n, 104n, 114n, 130n, 131n, 132 and n, 133 and n, 134n, 135 and n, 136 and n, 137n, 138n, 139 and n
Sirkap 79n
Śiśupāla 62
Sītā 18
Śiva 3, 32, 40-41, 82, 87, 93-95, 99, 100 and n, 101n, 103, 107n, 111-13
Śivadatta 131
Śivaghoṣa 131
Śiva-Kaivalya 108
Skanda 99, 111
Skandagupta 47 and n, 52
Smith 13n, 28n
Snay Pol inscription 97
Soḍāsa 131-32, 134
Sogdiana 34
Sogi clan 29n
Sohgaura copper-plate inscription 49
Solaṇapura 87 and n
Soma 99, 102
Soma sacrifice 82
Someśvara 90
Someśvara II Cālukya 85, 90
Someśvaradeva 89
Soṇa *(Amātya)* 78
Sonepur 89
Soras 39n
Spalagadames 33 and n
Spalahores 33 and n
Śramaṇa 23, 136
Śrāvastī 49
Śreṇī 71
Śrīcandra 5
Śrīdvārika *(Amātya)* 78
Śrīndraloka 98
Stanford 95n
Stein 51, 133n, 134n
Stein, R. 91n
Stern, P. 106n
Strategos 134
Strato I 3, 17 and n, 36
Strato II 36
Strato III 36
Sudarśana lake 46-47
Śūdra 44-48
Śukra 101n
Śukranīti, Śukranītisāra 7, 45, 79n
Sumantra 79n
Sumika 121
Sunkasāyika 121
Sūrya 72, 99, 111
Sūryavarman 99n
Sūryavarman I 103n, 105-06, 108-13
Sūryavarman II 99n, 109, 111
Suttadhara 125
Suttanipāta 116, 120n, 122n
Suttapiṭaka 114
Suvarṇapura 89, 90
Suviśākha 47, 52
Suyya 47
Svayambhū (Brahman) 102
Sylvain Lévi 92n
Syria 33-34, 38
Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa 11, 95n, 102
Takṣuma 138
Talamanchi inscription 104n
Taleswar plate 134
Taraṇadāsa 131
Tarn 17, 18, 35-37, 38 and n, 39-40
Tarn, W. W. 33-34
Taxila 31, 38n
Tchen-la 93-95, 96n, 97
Telapatta Jātaka 117
Telugu-Coḍa dynasty 89-90
Thakur, U. 67
Thaplyal, K. K. 76
Thou Ying 91
Tibet 73
Tigiria (Cuttack Dist.) 89
Tiṣyarakṣitā 15
Trailokyamalla (Cālukya king) 82
Trasadasyu 97n
Trigarta people 30
Trimūrti 3

Tripurī 31 and n
Tuṇḍila Jātaka 124
Tuol Ta Pec 110
Tuṣāspha *(Yavanarāja)* 46
Ubhatobhaṭṭha Jātaka 123, 127
Udayādityavarman I 108
Uddhava 63
Uddyotakesarin 86-89
Ugrasena 63
Ujjain, Ujjayinī 31 and n, 47
Ulāna 133 and n, 135
Upalihama *(Amātya)* 77
Uparājā 122 and n, 123, 125, 128n
Upendra (Kṛṣṇa-Viṣṇu) 103, 112
Uroḍeya 84-85
Uśanahsmṛti 136
Utkala 86-87, 89-90
Utpala 134
Utrecht 95n
Uttara-Kuru 30
Uttara-Madra 30
Uttarāpatha 101n
Vairantya 16
Vaiśya 14, 46, 48
Vājapeya sacrifice 100
Vajrahasta V 90n
Vakamihira 135
Vakana 138
Vakanapati 130, 138, 139
Vakkaleri grant 101n
Valāna 133 and n
Vaḷḷabha (Cālukya king) 101n
Vandur 84
Varāhmihira 48
Varanasi 31, 77
Varka 138n
Varuṇa 101-02
Vasa dynasty 65
Vasiṣṭha 16 ; *Dharmasūtra* 98n
Vāsudeva (Kṛṣṇa) 62
Vāsudeva (Kuṣāṇa king) 135, 137
Vaṭṭaka Jātaka 126-27
Vat Phu mountain 93
Vāvātā 10-12
Vāyu 72
Vāyu Purāṇa 99
Vedavyāsasmṛti 136
Vemaki dynasty 27, 30
Vena 99
Verma, O. P. 1, 3-4, 9, 81
Vesāli 125 and n
Vibhaṅga 121, 122n
Vicitravīra 86
Vicitravīrya 19
Vidiśā 14-15, 31
Viduratha 16
Vidyeśadhīmat 109
Vietnam 91
Vijaygarh inscription 29
Vijaya (king of Ceylon) 119
Vinaya Piṭaka 114-16, 119-22, 127n
Vindhyas 104
Vinicay-āmacca 126
Vinicaya-Mahāmatta 125
Vinicaya-sālā 124
Vinicaya-ṭṭhāna 124
Vīrabāhu 79n
Vīrasena 78n
Vīrayaśas (Kaulūta) 28
Viśākhadatta 96n
Viṣṇu 3, 20, 95-97, 99-100, 103-04, 110-11, 113
Viṣṇu (Smṛtikāra) 80n
Viṣṇu Dharmasūtra 130n, 136n
Viṣṇudharmottara Purāṇa 99n, 104
Viṣṇu Purāṇa 96n, 99n
Viṣṇuvardhana-Yośovarman 101n
Visuddhi-devā 117
Visuddhimagga 114, 121
Viśvarūpa 102n
Viśvāsika (Vaiśvāsika) 135
Vitastā river 47
Vogel 139 and n
Vohārika-Mahāmatta 119, 125
Vokkāṇa 138
Vonones 33 and n

Vṛṣṇi 28, 63-65
Wakhan 138
Whitehead, R. B. 33n
Winternitz, M. 114n
Wittfogel, Karl A. 46 and n
Yādava people 63
Yājñavalkya 20n, 78n, 80n ; *smṛti* 130n, 131n, 136
Yama 98n, 102 and n, 107
Yaśorāja 90
Yaśovarman 99n, 103, 111-13
Yaśovarman-Viṣṇuvardhana 101n
Yaudheya 25, 27 and n, 29, 31 ; *gaṇa* 8, 26
Yayāti 88n
Yayāti I 87
Yayāti II Caṇḍihara 86-88
Yayāti III 86n
Yayātinagara 87-88, 90
Yogīśvara-paṇḍita II 108
Yudhiṣṭhira 19, 50, 62
Yuvarāja 132
Zeus 36n
Zoilus I 40-41, 43
Zoilus Dikaios 40n

13-9-2000.